THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

JOSEPH Q. ADAMS MYRA B. MARTIN

HARDIN CRAIG WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON

VOL. XI. APRIL, 1936 No. 2

CONTENTS

		PAGE
Exit George Wilkins?	*William T. Hastings*	67
Hamlet and Gertrude, or The Conscience of the Queen	*Robert M. Smith*	84
The Costumes of *Love's Labor's Lost, Twelfth Night,* and *The Tempest*	*Bernice Freeman*	93
Index of Names in the 1935 Bibliography	*S. A. Tannenbaum*	107
COMMUNICATIONS		
Shakspere's Ghosts	*Samuel A. Small*	118
Adding a Word to Shakspere's Vocabulary	*S. A. Tannenbaum*	120
Queen Elizabeth and Woman Pages	*Marion Ansel Taylor*	122
A Shakspere Conference in the U. S. S. R.		123
EDITORIAL COMMENTS AND REVIEWS		125

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 808 West End Avenue, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 808 West End Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1935, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The assurance that many millions of people will be introduced to Shakspere soon, has just been provided by the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Film Corporation. Under the supervision of Irving G. Thalberg, the picturization of William Shakspere's *Romeo and Juliet* has just been completed.

This production, we are informed, has been given the most exhaustive research and careful supervision ever accorded a motion picture. In the selection of its actors, in the design of the settings and costumes, even in the choice of the proper version of the play, and the cutting of the script into its film form, "every precaution has been taken to make this film realize everything its author intended to portray." We are promised definitely that not a word has been added to the Shakspere dialogue. The producers also inform us that the cuts in the script are relatively insignificant compared to the majority of the stage versions used in the past.

The cast includes Leslie Howard as Romeo, Norma Shearer as Juliet, John Barrymore as Mercutio, Basil Rathbone as Tybalt, Reginald Denny as Benvolio, Edna May Oliver as the Nurse, C. Aubrey Smith as Capulet, Violet Kemble Cooper as Lady Capulet, and such notable actors as Henry Kolker, Conway Tearle, Robert Warwick and Anthony Kemble Cooper, in lesser parts.

Such amusing items as the following hint at the care and extraordinary regard for "authenticity" which went into the production. Two cameramen were sent to Verona to photograph that town from every angle. In addition to taking 2,769 photographs of the town, they made reproductions of old paintings and drawings of the gardens, buildings and every conceivable item which might occur in the making of the picture. From all these drawings, photographs, etc., fifty-four huge models were made of the settings. These scale models were then reproduced in full size on more than twelve acres of land.

The picture was made under the direction of George Cukor, well-known as a stage director. It has taken more than six months to film.

Although there has been this meticulous regard for authenticity, it has not caused mere slavish imitation. In other words, though the period is fixed in the high Renaissance, about 1450, the buildings used are not of that period.

The greatest care was exercised in the selection of the properties used for the picture, which total more than three thousand. From the ducats that pass from the hand of Romeo to the Apothecary, to the suit of armor worn by Paris, every item used was either an original borrowed from museums or a faithful reproduction wrought by artisans who had pride of craft. Months, almost a year, was spent by hundreds of workers, ranging from seamstresses to blacksmiths, from armorers to bootmakers, in the making of the properties which lend atmosphere such as no one has ever been privileged to witness on the stage in the filming of Shakspere's great love story. None of the "fine frenzy" that Shakspere lavished on this play has been lost in its translation to the cinema.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer invokes the criticism of our association in the belief that no real authority on Shakspere could witness this film without feeling that Shakspere has, for the first time in motion pictures, been given his due. Considering the amount of bustling action Shakspere put into this play, it lends itself admirably to picturization. If the poetry will not be sacrificed to the action and the scenery, this should be a memorable picture and render an invaluable service to Shakspere lovers.

EXIT GEORGE WILKINS?

By WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

I.

Wilkins and *Pericles*—The Wilkins Canon

PERICLES, though never since its own day "much admired",[1] still fascinates us with a number of vexing problems, most prominent among them the question of authorship. In the limited space now at my disposal I should like to make some observations on this topic, or rather, on one aspect of it: Can the second "hand" in the play (I think we may rule out a third author) be identified with any confidence as that of George Wilkins?

It is feasible, I believe, to focus attention on this question, to the exclusion of arguments on several related questions with which I hope on another occasion to deal: the date of the play, Shakspere's part in the play, and the rival claims of other dramatists than Wilkins to the un-Shaksperian portions of it. For the moment I must be content to say that my present argument assumes (1) that Shakspere rehandled a complete earlier play, taking over some portions untouched, revising some portions, and completely rewriting more than half of it, (2) that no date can be set as the earlier limit for the time of composition of the earlier play, (3) that the play which Blount entered in the Stationer's Register on May 20, 1608, was the Shaksperian play, and (4) that—except for the rather vague limits set by metrical and stylistic evidence—it is possible to suppose Shakspere's work on the play to have been done at any time between the publication of Riche's *Soldier's Wish to Britain's Welfare* in 1604[2] and the date of Blount's entry. These assumptions are not of equal importance to my argument, which indeed in its main outlines could stand without them. But if we assume Shakspere to have been a reviser rather than a collaborator, and recognize that neither the original play nor the revision can be dated with any closeness, our search for

[1] According to the title-page of Q1 (1609) it was "The Late and much admired Play, called *Pericles, Prince of Tyre.*"

[2] Identified by Steevens as the source of Thaliard's Joke in I. iii, 4.

the original author widens its scope greatly. We no longer are restricted to 1607-8, the period of George Wilkins's literary activity.

Critical opinion today pretty solidly supports Wilkins's claim.[3] His authorship, first suggested by Delius in 1868[4] and espoused with further arguments by Fleay,[5] Boyle,[6] and H. T. Baker,[7] has been most elaborately defended by H. D. Sykes[8] and G. S. Greene.[9] The case is based upon (1) the supposed relation between Wilkins's 'novel', *The Painful Adventures of Pericles,* and the play, (2) the similarity in type of *Pericles* and plays in which Wilkins is known to have had a part, (3) the presence in *Pericles* of Wilkinsian peculiarities of grammar, sentence structure, and rhyme, (4) versification, and (5) numerous parallels in phrasing and imagery between *Pericles* and the works of Wilkins. I hope to show that though the body of argument in favor of Wilkins is impressive in amount, it is wholly inconclusive, and that there is a very strong case against him.

A fundamental weakness in the case for Wilkins is that we know very little about his work, and have therefore a very insecure basis for ascriptions. [Sykes and others, it is true, have been busy building up a Wilkins canon. In the most liberal view (a view certainly quite absurd, though there is no space for analysis of the list here) it includes three plays, *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage, A Yorkshire Tragedy,* and *The London Prodigal;* a share in five other plays, *Timon of Athens, Pericles, The Travels of the Three English Brothers, Law Tricks,* and *Humour Out of Breath;* three pamphlets, *Three Miseries of Barbary, The Painful Adventures of Pericles,* and *The History of Hamblet;* a share in two other tracts, *Two Most Unnatural*

[3] He is accepted, for example, without reservation, by Adams *(Life of William Shakespeare,* 399), Deighton (Arden edition), and Lee (Q1 facs. 14); and tentatively by Bellinger (Yale edition), Chambers *(William Shakespeare,* I. 22, 520), A. M. Clark (*Thomas Heywood,* 333), and Neilson (Cambridge Poets edition). D. L. Thomas *(Engl. Stud.,* XXXIX. 210) and H. D. Gray *(P. M. L. A.,* XL. 507) are proponents of Thomas Heywood.

[4] *Sh. Jahrb.* III. 175.

[5] *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874, 195; *Sh. Manual,* 209.

[6] *Engl Stud.* V. 363; *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1882, 323.

[7] *PMLA.* XXIII. 100.

[8] *Sidelights on Sh.* 143.

[9] *George Wilkins,* unpubl. Cornell diss., 1925.

and Bloody Murders and *Jests to Make You Merry;* and a dedicatory sonnet prefixed to Spenser's *Amoretti.* But in defining the Wilkins manner we must make use only of his known works; otherwise, our criteria are bound to suffer contamination. For our purposes the canon would then be reduced at once to *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage, The Travels of the Three English Brothers,* and the tracts *Three Miseries of Barbary, The Painful Adventures of Pericles,* and *Jests to Make You Merry.* Moreover, if with Professor Oliphant we agree to exclude (as a basis for criteria of authorship) all collaborated works, the canon suffers further diminution. The *Three Brothers* was written with Day and Rowley and the *Jests* with Dekker. Moreover, Greene has shown that the *Three Miseries* leans heavily upon Dekker tracts, and the *Painful Adventures* consists largely of paraphrase of and pillage from Lawrence Twine's *Pattern of Painful Adventures.* Clark, the Heywood authority, even suggests that the one usually undisputed Wilkins play, *Miseries of Enforced Marriage,* was cobbled up by Wilkins out of work not wholly his and contains at least one scene by Thomas Heywood; "his work", says Clark,[10] speaking of Wilkins generally, "is so inextricably involved with that of other men, except in his prose pamphlets, that it is impossible to pronounce any passage to be pure Wilkins." The pamphlets should not have been excepted, as even cursory collations will show.]

Making the most liberal allowance possible, we may take as a basis for our estimate of Wilkins, *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* (except the opening scene), and those parts of *The Painful Adventures of Pericles* which are not derived from Twine or from the play. Those parts of the *Three Miseries* for which no source in Dekker can be traced are nevertheless too heavily colored by the Dekker manner to be utilized. No other works can safely be considered at all, except the *Three Brothers,* as to type of play.

---

[10] *Op. cit.,* p. 302.

II.

The Play and the Novel.

Wilkins's name was first associated with *Pericles* through his authorship of the pamphlet or "novel", *The Painful Adventures of Pericles Prince of Tyre,* published in 1608.[1] His conventional reference to his novel in the dedication as "this poore infant of my braine" was mistakenly thought to refer to the play; out of it Delius, followed by H. T. Baker, developed the highly improbable theory that Wilkins, offended because Shakspere took over his play and revamped it, sought by the novel to establish his original claim—a strange sentiment in one who was himself so persistent a plagiarist.[2] The argument of H. D. Sykes follows quite another course. He believes that Wilkins first wrote the novel, and afterwards based the play upon it; he supports his belief by arguing that Wilkins, similarly, wrote first the Calverly murder tract (the first of the two narratives in *Two Most Unnatural and Bloody Murders*) and then the play based upon it, *A Yorkshire Tragedy*. *A priori* it would, on the contrary, seem that the more certainly his authorship of the tract were established, the less likely would be his authorship of the play. Again, Sykes's analogical argument from the Calverly tract and *A Yorkshire Tragedy* is vulnerable. He assumes the account of the second "bloody murder" not to be by Wilkins, though the styles of the two pieces seem identical; his ascription of the first narrative to Wilkins is at least dubious, since its style in many points suggests Dekker; and after Clark's detailed analysis[3] Wilkins's claim to the authorship of *A Yorkshire Tragedy* is much in doubt.

Furthermore, and most significant, the relation of *The Painful Adventures of Pericles* to the play is certainly not what the advocates of Wilkins have supposed. It is a piece of hack-work, written after the play with Shakspere's alterations was on the boards, and was intended to coin money from the latter's vogue. The exact and inexact reproduc-

[1] Edited by Tycho Mommsen, Oldenburg, 1857.
[2] See Thomas, *op. cit.*, 221-22, for detailed rebuttal.
[3] *Op. cit.* 301-28.

tion in it of unquestionably Shaksperian phrases from the play[4] makes the play's priority obvious. This fact alone greatly lessens the significance of the novel in any consideration of the authorship of *Pericles*. But the character of Wilkins's version, it seems to me, constitutes well-nigh conclusive evidence that he did not write the play.[5]

I well remember the hot summer day in 1932 when, as I was laboriously collating the play and Wilkins's novel and Twine's *Pattern of Painful Adventures*[6], it suddenly dawned on me that here was a colossal practical joke or a colossal piece of nerve—quite analogous to that of Dekker in making a new title-page, dedication, and opening paragraph pass off an old tract as a new one[7]. The truth is that *The Painful Adventures of Pericles* is not in any sense a real paraphrase of the play of *Pericles* as it was being performed in 1608; nor is it a paraphrase of it in its pre-Shaksperian form, with which, according to the prevailing hypothesis, Wilkins as its author should have been fully familiar. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that *The Painful Adventures* is, instead, a reissue of Twine's *Pattern of Painful Adventures,* extensively revised and modified to make it pass as a paraphrase of the play. That in his text as well as in his title-page Wilkins was a good deal indebted to Twine has always been recognized, but the precise character of the indebtedness—that he was in fact virtually revising Twine—has not been stated, except cursorily in a footnote by Gray.[8] It would be tedious to set down here in any detail the course of Wilkins's operations. The type of his borrowings from Twine has been carefully exhibited by Miss Spiker, who thinks, however, of Wilkins as paraphrasing the play with the help of Twine, rather than the opposite, and to a number of those detailed judgments one might voice friendly objection, were there time. I should guess that well above a third of the novel consists of para-

---

[4] See Collier's introduction to Mommsen's edition of the novel, p. xxxiii; also Thomas and Chambers.

[5] This is also the conclusion of Sina Spiker's excellent article, *George Wilkins and the Authorship of Pericles." Studies in Philology,* XXX. 551.

[6] In the undated edition assigned to the 1590's, which is reprinted in Hazlitt's *Shakespeare's Library,* IV. 229.

[7] See *A Knight's Conjuring,* 1607, which is really the 2d. edition of *News from Hell,* 1606; and the successive reissues of *Lanthorne and Candle-light.*

[8] *Op. cit.* 508, note 10.

phrases or verbatim transcripts of Twine, and that Wilkins's rhetorical expansions of suggestions from Twine and from the play[9] constitue at least another third of the text. More important is the fact that except where the play's different treatment of the story forces Wilkins to follow it consistently,[10] the details of play dialogue and action come in fragmentarily and inconsecutively, while the basic fabric is derived from Twine. The eleven chapters into which the novel is divided were suggested by the chapter division of Twine, their headings are (with a single exception) paraphrased from Twine's headings, six of the eleven chapters both begin and end with paraphrases or transcripts of the matter at the beginning and end of corresponding chapters in Twine, and four of the remaining five either begin or end similarly. It follows that the chapter divisions are not primarily determined by the structures of the play. Moreover with the chapters the order of details is frequently controlled by Twine's sequence rather than that of the play.[11] A rapid collation with Twine of Chapters I, VIII, IX, and XI of *The Painful Adventures,* or only the first and last of these, will provide the curious with abundant support for these assertions. It is to me inconceivable that Wilkins should have gone to the trouble of this elaborate adjustment of Twine to the play if the play had been his own composition. It would, in that case, have been a simple task to turn the play itself directly into narrative.

There is another characteristic of *The Painful Adventures* which provides a final, and perhaps equally conclusive, reason for denying Wilkins's authorship of the play: his frequent misrepresentation, which seems sometimes a misunderstanding, of the meaning of the test. He obviously had some sort of text of the play to work with,[12] but the phrases he transfers from it to his novel were often either garbled in the process of securing them (if stolen in the theater) or

[9] Miss Spiker (*Op. cit.* 553-54) appears to think that these last frequently are based upon passages in the play not preserved in Q1. I do not believe that this is true, with one or two possible exceptions.

[10] Particularly I, iv, the relief of Tarsus; II. i, ii, iii, v, the Pentapolis episode; and IV. ii, v, vi, the brothel scenes.

[11] See Chapter IX.

[12] I do not agree with Miss Spiker (*Op. cit.* 558) that acquaintance with the play through attendance at a few performances would suffice; though there are apparent traces of stage business in the novel.

carelessly perverted or vulgarized by him. In either case —whether he accepted another's perversions of the text or introduced his own—his work seems too unscrupulous to be that of the original author of the play.

[Passing over the constant petty garbling, I will cite only a few conspicuous misrepresentations. In Act II, Scene iv, of the play the lords beg Helicanus to relieve their "griefs" by telling them whether Pericles is alive or dead; and if he be dead, they ask that Helicanus become their sovereign. Helicanus easily persuades them to be patient for a year. Wilkins develops this into "an vnciuil and giddy muteny" of the "headstrong multitude", whose "clamors" are with difficulty pacified. The melancholy of Pericles at the court of Simonides is ascribed in the play (II, iii, 54-56) to his sense of superiority; in Wilkins to "slacknesse" in his entertainment. Again, the character of Lysimachus in the present version of the play is quite clearly purified; but Wilkins assigns him some of the "concupiscence" of Twine's Athenagoras, and he vulgarizes and weakens his concluding speeches to Marina,[13] though his paraphrase shows traces of the Shaksperian diction of the original. The words of Lysimachus—

> Had I brought hither a corrupted mind,
> Thy speech had alter'd it. Hold, here's gold for thee.
> Persever in that clear way thou goest
> . . . . . .
> For me, be you thoughten
> That I came with no ill intent . . .
> . . . . . .
> Fare thee well. Thou art a piece of virtue, and
> I doubt not but thy training hath been noble.
> Hold, here's more gold for thee.
> A curse upon him, die he like a thief,
> That robs thee of thy virtue—

become in Wilkins:

> "I hither came with thoughtes intemperate, foul and deformed, the which your pains so well hath laued, that they are now white, continue still to all so, and for my parte, who hither came but to haue payd the price, a peece of gold for your virginitie, now giue you twenty . . . It shall become you still to be euen as you are, a

[13] IV. vi. 111-23.

> piece of goodnesse . . . and if that any shall inforce you ill, if you but send to me, I am your friend [Inept and lame conclusion!]."

There are a good many weakenings of the phrasing. In Act II, Scene v, 54-56, Pericles declares that if anyone but the King calls him traitor, "Even in his throat . . . I return the lie"; Wilkins substitutes the feeble "euen in his bosome he would write the lie." Pericles goes on (lines 61-62):

> I came unto your court for Honor's cause,
> And not to be a rebel to her state.

Wilkins removes the personification of Honor, writing: "affirming, that he came into his Court in search of honour, and not to be a rebel to his [*i.e.*, Simonides'] state." Again, Wilkins in paraphrasing the scene between Pericles and the fishermen (II, i.) substitutes "learned" for "tell" in line 53, where "tell" seems to mean "exhibit", "illustrate":

> How from the finny subject of the sea
> These fishers tell th' infirmities of men

and just below, in lines 122-24, he substitutes the colorless word "case" for "right" in the witticism: "here's a fish hangs in the net, like a poor man's right in the law; 't will hardly come out."] To give one more example, in Pericles IV, ii, 47-49, Boult, arriving at the brothel with Marina, announces: "Master, I have gone through for this piece, you see. If you like her, so; if not, I have lost my earnest." Here "gone through" means "endured much", "made a great effort." Wilkins uses the phrase in the sense of "completed the bargain": "hee foorth with demaunded the price. . . And in the end, went thorow, and bargained to haue her, paying . . . " There are similar and equally numerous perversions of the sense in the passages derived from Twine; and from such a scrutiny of the novel as a whole one concludes that Wilkins was merely a facile and unscrupulous literary jackal.

III.

The type of *Pericles*.

I should for my part be content to leave the argument at this point, but it is necessary at least to touch on the other

items in the case for Wilkins. It is urged as corroborative evidence that in type *Pericles* resembles the other plays in which Wilkins had a hand. Only two plays claim consideration. Of these, *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* is wholly unlike *Pericles,* being a domestic tragedy with a happy ending, supplemented by a sub-plot of vulgar low comedy. *The Travels of the Three English Brothers,* of which Wilkins was part author, is claimed to be, like *Pericles,* an "adventure play". It is an adventure play of a sort, it is true; and it has a further superficial resemblance to *Pericles* in containing five Chorus speeches, three with dumbshows. But it is really quite unlike our play. *Pericles* presents an ancient story in a romantic epic manner with systematic use of narrative interludes, while the *Three Brothers* is contemporary, is pseudo-realistic, and is haphazard in its form.[1]

IV.

The manner of *Pericles.*

It is urged, further, that the non-Shaksperian parts of *Pericles* reveal many peculiarities of grammar, sentence structure, and rhyme which denote the presence of Wilkins. These are enumerated and copiously illustrated by Sykes and Greene. But ellipses of the relative pronoun in the nominative, verbal antitheses, and awkward constructions are widespread in Elizabethan dramatic verse. Defective rhyme, repetition for rhyme, and stock rhymes flourished from the days of Greene and Peele.[2] The general literary character of the original *Pericles* is difficult to define, because the text is corrupt and because of the retouchings by Shakspere. But a fair idea of it can be formed from Act I, Scene iv (the relief of Tarsus), which seems not to have suffered more mutilation or revision. To this may perhaps be added the speeches of Pericles in the riddle-reading scene (I, i) and his melancholy soliloquy in the following scene (I, ii). These together give us the impression of a writer of rather regular, but not stiff, end-stopped verse, who was sometimes prosaic but generally lucid, and who at times

[1] See also Thomas, pp. 223, 228.
[2] See Thomas, 226; Clark, 319-20.

commanded a pleasant surface poetry. Wilkins's verse in *The Miseries* is more awkward and more bathetic, the phrasing often loose in logic. At its best it attains merely to rhetorical force. His prose in the parts of *The Painful Adventures* to which he can lay claim consists mostly of shallow theatrical elaborations of ideas transferred from his sources, in a weakly Euphuistic vein.

V.

The argument from versification.

Again, it has been argued by Fleay[1] and Sykes[2] that metrical statistics support Wilkins's authorship of the first two acts of *Pericles*. In reply it may be urged (1) that such statistics can at most only establish a possibility, (2) that the value of the statistics in this case is greatly lessened by the corrupt state of the text and by the probable presence of Shaksperian passages in these acts, and (3) that the metrical evidence is, in fact, quite ambiguous. In support of this last statement the following table should suffice:

	% short lines	% rhyme	% fem. ending	% run-on lines	
Pericles I-II	7	24	16	13	
Wilkins: *Miseries of Enf. Marriage*	14	38	13	12*	*H.D.Sykes: 6%
Heywood: *Royal King and Loyal Subject*	3.8	22	18	17	
Comedy of Errors		16	17	13	
Richard II		19	11	20	

From these figures it would even seem easy to find a place for *Pericles,* I-II, among the early plays of Shakspere!

VI.

The argument from parallels.

Finally, the most impressive argument for Wilkins's authorship of the original *Pericles* derives from alleged

[1] *Op. cit.,* 215
[2] *Op. cit.,* article on *A Yorkshire Tragedy,* p. 80.

parallel passages in the play and in the known or alleged works of Wilkins. Boyle began the citation of parallels, which has reached its climax in the work of Sykes and Greene. Anyone but a disillusioned student of parallels who reads Sykes's essay is bound to be convinced by his copious parade of passages. But to the hard-hearted analyist it is anything but convincing. There is no need, after Professor Oliphant's essay,[1] to set forth here the pitfalls of parallels. Most supposed parallels are not valid and mean nothing: and if they are *bona fide* and mean something, it is often an open question what that meaning is. In an admitted parallel it may be, as the parallel hunters invariably assume, one author repeating himself; it may, however, be an accidental correspondence, or a case of conscious or unconscious plagiariam, or even a commonplace of idiom or imagery now not recognized as such.

The weakness of the "parallels argument" for Wilkins may be illustrated by a frontal attack on the key parallel, that which was first quoted—the whale and the parish joke. The passages brought together by the Wilkinsians are these:

(1) *Pericles,* II, i, 25-55:

> *3. Fisherman.* Nay, master, said not I as much when I saw the porpoise how he bounc'd and tumbled? They say they're half fish, half flesh. A plague on them, they ne'er come but I look to be wash'd. Master, I marvel how the fishes live in the sea.
>
> *1. Fisherman.* Why, as men do a-land; the great ones eat up the little ones. I can compare our rich misers to nothing so fitly as to a whale; 'a plays and tumbles, driving the poor fry before him, and at last devours them all at a mouthful. Such whales have I heard on o' the land, who never leave gaping till they swallow'd the whole parish, church, steeple, bells, and all.
>
> *Pericles.* [*Aside*]. A pretty moral.
>
> *3. Fisherman.* But, master, if I had been the sexton, I would have been that day in the belfry.
>
> *2. Fisherman.* Why, man?
>
> *3. Fisherman.* Because he should have swallowed me too; and when I had been in his belly, I would have kept such a jangling of the bells, that he should never have left, till he cast bells, steeple, church, and parish, up again. But if the good King Simonides were of my mind,—
>
> *Pericles.* [*Aside*]. Simonides!

---

[1] "How Not to Play the Game of Parallels." JEGP, Jan. 1929. See also Chambers: *William Shakespeare,* I. 222.

3. Fisherman. We would purge the land of these drones, that rob the bee of her honey.

Pericles. [*Aside*]. How from the finny subject of the sea
These fishers tell th' infirmities of men;
And from their watery empire recollect
All that may men approve or men detect!

(2) Wilkins's Novel, 26-27.

". . . certayne Fishermen . . . passed away their labour with discourse to this purpose, in comparing the sea to Brokers and Usurers, who seeme faire, and look louely till they haue got men into their clutches, when one tumbles them, and an other tosses them, but seldome leauing vntill they haue suncke them. Againe comparing our riche men unto Whales, that make a great shew in the worlde, rowling and tumbling vp and downe, but are good for little but to sincke others: that the fishes liue in the sea, as the powerfull on shoare, the great ones eate vp the little ones . . ."

(3) *Law Tricks,* I, ii.

Joculo. But, madam, do you remember what a multitude of fishes we saw at sea? And I wonder how they can all live by one another.

Emilia. Why, fool, as men do on the land; the great ones eat up the little ones.

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Adam. I knew one of that faculty [the law] in one term eat up a whole town, church, steeple, and all.

Julio. I wonder the bells rang not all in his belly.

(4) *Miseries of Enforced Marriage,* III, ii:

Young heirs left in this town, where sin's so rank,
And prodigals gape to grow fat by them,
Are like young whelps thrown in the lions' den,
Who play with them awhile, at length devour them.

(5) *Miseries of Enforced Marriage,* IV, ii:

These men,[2] like fish, do swim within one stream
Yet they'd eat one another.

(6) *Travels of Three English Brothers:*

I think that the seas
Play'd with us but as great men do a-land,
Hurl'd us now up, then down.[3]

---

[2] The reference in this speech of the butler is to Wentloe and Bartley, the two wastrels, each of whom hopes to marry the supposed heiress.

[3] A. H. Bullen, ed.: *Works of John Day,* 41.

(7) *Humour out of Breath:*

"I can compare my fortune, and my vnfortunate selfe, to nothing so fitlie as my base here . . . ."[4]

(8) *London Prodigal,* I, i, 60:

"Let him drink on, so he drinke not churches.'[5]

The process by which the argument has grown is interesting. Bullen first noted the *Pericles-Miseries* parallel;[6] but he supposed the *Pericles* passage Shaksperian and left open the question of plagiarism by Shakspere. Boyle, believing *Pericles* I-II to be by Wilkins, found Wilkins repeating himself; and, adducing the *Law Tricks* and *Three Brothers* parallels, argued for Wilkins's collaboration with Day in *Law Tricks.* Sykes included all these parallels in his essay, and, reasoning in a circle so far as *Law Tricks* is concerned, supposed all the passages together to provide unshakable evidence of Wilkins's authorship of *Pericles.* Greene subsequently adduced the "drinke not churches" parallel from *The London Prodigal* in support of his argument for Wilkins's authorship of that play.

Before raising other points of objection, it should be noted that the parallel between *Pericles* and Wilkins's novel proves nothing about the authorship of the play, for in the passage in the novel Wilkins was obviously paraphrasing the play—and badly. Of the others, only the *Miseries* passages are certainly by Wilkins. Those in *Three Brothers* may be his, but the allocation of scenes in that play to Wilkins is conjectural. There is great uncertainty as to Wilkins's authorship of *The London Prodigal.* He certainly had no hand in *Law Tricks* or in *Humour out of Breath;* the lines cited stand in passages whose diction and rhythm clearly belong to Day's light and facile style. This discovery of parallels in passages or plays which are doubtfully Wilkinsian or definitely not his, has the effect of greatly weakening the significance of the more legitimate parallel

---

[4] Bullen: *Op. cit.* 67. Cited by Greene. See *Pericles.* II. i. 32: "I can compare our rich misers to nothing so filthy as to a whale. . . ." Greene finds the same formula also in Day's *Isle of Gulls,* in a passage which he does not even tentatively claim for Wilkins.

[5] Cited by Greene

[6] *Athenaeum,* Sept. 21, 1878.

between *Pericles* and *The Miseries.* One wonders whether they were not all making use of what was in its main outlines a stock joke. The conjecture becomes almost a conviction when one discovers further parallels—and in works which even the most sanguine could hardly ascribe to Wilkins; for example,

in Greene's *James IV* (1591?) Slipper, who has swallowed the world, in the form of toast, complains that "the world . . . keepes such a rumbling in my stomach . . ."[7]

in *All's Well that Ends Well* (1602?) Parolles, in his coward's terror, declares that Bertram "is a whale to virginity, and devours up all the fry it finds."[8]

in Middleton and Dekker's *The Roaring Girl* (1610?) Sergeant Curtilax, the sheriff's officer, in justifying his activity against debtors, declares: "all that liue in the world, are but great fish and little fish, and feede vpon one another, some eate vp whole men, a Seriant cares but for the shoulder of a man . . ."[9]

There is, further, the question of priority among the variants collected by Boyle, Sykes, and Greene. If we consider only the dates of publication, as these critics seem to have done, we might not unnaturally suppose *Pericles,* the last to be printed, to be indebted to one or more of the other plays, even if we did not concede Wilkins's authorship of all the passages.[10] But if, for the purpose of this argument, my earlier assumption regarding the date of composition of *Pericles* be granted—that there is no definite earlier limit for the original play, and nothing later than 1604 for the Shaksperian version—it becomes legitimate to consider whether in the various forms of the joke there is perhaps any internal evidence as to priority. A comparison of the collected passages indicates that the various ingredients of the joke were widely familiar. They appear for the most part isolated rather than in combination. The first *Law*

[7] II. i. 186.
[8] IV. iii. 249-50.
[9] Pearson's Dekker. III. 190.
[10] The schedule is: *London Prodigal,* 1605; *Miseries,* 1607 (Sta. Reg. July 31, 1607); *Three English Brothers,* 1607 (based on a pamphlet entered in Sta. Reg. June 29, 1607); *Law Tricks,* 1608; *Humour out of Breath,* 1608; *Painful Adventures of Pericles,* 1608; *Pericles,* 1609.

Tricks passage is thrust in inappropriately (without application to the situation); the second is attached to a satirical dialogue about lawyers. The first passage in *The Miseries,* comparing young heirs to whelps in a lion's den (not to fish), looks like the hasty patching up of a formula; the second deals not with big fish devouring little fish, but with two "sharks" each ready to eat the other. The one from the *Three Brothers* is like the feeble and garbled paraphrases which appear in Wilkins's *Painful Adventures of Pericles.* In contrast to all these the *Pericles* passage is well worked up, complete, witty, definitely in character, and appropriate to the situation. If a direct relation is to be supposed between the passages in *Pericles* and those in the Wilkinsian *Miseries* and *Three Brothers,* the internal evidence all points to the priority of *Pericles* and subsequent plagiarism by Wilkins.

[I can refer only briefly to a second and similar case, the parallel adduced by Sykes between the description of the sufferings from famine in Tarsus (*Pericles,* I, iv) and a passage in Wilkins's tract *The Three Miseries of Barbary.*[11] The question of priority again rises. Sykes dates the tract 1603, but Greene has shown[12] that it cannot have been published earlier than 1606 and may have been as late as 1610,[13] There are some obvious resemblances between the two passages, but there is a much closer parallel, not previously noted, between the *Pericles* passage and Dekker's *Canaan's Calamitie* of 1598.[14] The heart of Dekker's poem is the story of Miriam, who, at the time of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, cooks and eats her beloved child; in *Pericles* we have

> Those mothers, who, to nuzzle up their babes,
> Thought nought too curious, are ready now
> To eat those little darlings whom they lov'd.

In *The Three Miseries,* "they that before durst not come near one another for fear of being infected with the pestilence are now ready to lay hold each of other, and to turn

[11] *Op. cit.* 166-67.
[12] *MLN.* XXXIX. 5.
[13] He favors 1607 because that was Wilkins's big year.
[14] Huth Library edition of Dekker, I, 1-69. See particularly the address to the Gentlemen Readers, and a more diffused parallelism in pp. 10-12, 24-27, 30-45.

their own bodies into nourishment . . ."[15] It is here not a question of eating one's offspring. Is the passage in *The Three Miseries* Wilkins loosely out of Dekker, Wilkins loosely out of *Pericles,* or Dekker himself concealed behind a Wilkins dedication? The play appears to derive from Dekker, and can hardly do so *via* Wilkins. Wilkins's claim to *Pericles* is not advanced by the parallel.]

There is no time to analyze further in detail Sykes's parallels. It must suffice to say this: In his main examination of the text of the play[16] Sykes produces fifty-seven parallels from the known and supposed works of Wilkins. Of these twenty-four are from *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage,* twenty from *The Painful Adventures of Pericles,* seven from the *Travels of the Three English Brothers,* two each from *Three Miseries of Barbary* and *Law Tricks,* and one each from *A Yorkshire Tragedy* and *Jests to Make You Merry.* Those from the Pericles novel are obviously irrelevant, and those from the *Three Miseries* and from *Law Tricks* have been already considered. The only ones requiring further scrutiny are those from *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage,* as an admitted Wilkins play. Of these twenty-four parallels seven can be duplicated in Shakspere and two in other dramatists, and six are commonplaces. The remaining nine parallels are a very small residuum; but indeed if all twenty-four were valid, the question of the side on which the indebtedness lay would still remain—at least until it has been proved that *The Miseries* is the earlier play.

VII.

Conclusion.

In concluding this long and minute discussion I should like to allow myself the luxury of conjecture. I guess that among the publications of 1607, 1608, and 1609 we have the evidence of three successive attempts to profit by the success of a play as popular as *Edward IV.*[1] I guess that *Pericles* in the Shaksperian form was produced in the latter part of 1606 or the beginning of 1601. Its immediate popularity led to the reissue in 1607 of the old version of the

[15] Quoted by Sykes (not quite exactly), 167.
[16] *Op. cit.,* 160, ff.

Apollonius story, Twine's *Pattern of Painful Adventures,* and to various minor plagiarisms in plays of the year. In 1608 a plan to publish a surreptitious edition of the play was forestalled, on May 20, by Blount's blocking entry in the Stationer's Register, and the piratical impulse found its vent in the substitute issuing of a prose narrative by Wilkins, purporting to be "the true History of the Play of Pericles", though really faked up mainly from the recent reissue of Twine. Whether a complete text was obtained surreptitiously in 1608 and used by Wilkins, or whether he took Twine to the theater and made notes where needed, it is hard to say. It is, of course, possible that the novel was an independent venture, but it seems likely to have been connected in some way with an irregular project interrupted by Blount. Finally, in 1609, piracy was successful, and to the success of this third venture we owe the preservation of the play. Bad as the text is, we should be grateful to the pirate for preserving this earliest specimen of Shakspere's latest manner and providing scholars with a problem which can never be entirely solved. The ghost of George Wilkins, too, should be moved to gratitude, for without Q1 of *Pericles* his name would never have been linked with Shakspere's or have received more attention than that accorded to the most minor of literary hacks.

Brown University.

---

[1] Amazde I stood, to see a Crowd
Of Civill Throats stretchd out so lowd;
(As at a New-play) all the Roomes
Did swarme with Gentiles mix'd with Groomes,
So that I truly thought all These
Came to see *Shore* or *Pericles.*
Pimlyco or Ruune Red-cap (1609)

HAMLET AND GERTRUDE, or THE CONSCIENCE OF THE QUEEN

By Robert M. Smith

Coleridge, in his *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare,* complains: "I confess that Shakespeare has left the character of the queen in an unpleasant perplexity. Was she or was she not conscious of the fratricide?"[1] To judge from the continuing confusion and uncertainty among modern critics the question needs to be widened to read: What was the nature and extent of Queen Gertrude's guilt? Until some agreement on this age-old question in Hamlet criticism is forthcoming, we can have no sound interpretation of the world's most popular tragedy.

Four charges are brought against her in the course of the play: 1) hasty marriage; 2) incest; 3) adultery; and, 4) murder. Modern critics who have made extensive studies of the play, Bradley,[2] Stoll,[3] Lawrence,[4] Adams,[5] and Wilson,[6] exculpate her of murder, but hold her guilty on the other three counts. Keller[7] and Van Dam,[8] on the other hand, pronounce her guilty only of hasty marriage and incest; whereas Jones[9] attempts to palliate the hasty marriage and to argue away the incest. Baudin[10] is one among many critics wholly oblivious to another point too often overlooked, that Hamlet suspected her of murder also, and therefore intended the first part of his Mouse Trap principally to test his mother's innocence and guilt of the murder, just as he contrived the last part, beginning with the poisoning, to catch the conscience of the King. Let us see what can be done to clarify these typical conflicing views.

---

1 Coleridge, S. T., *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism,* ed. by T. M. Raysor. London, 1930. Vol. I, p. 33.

2 Bradley, A. C., *Shakespearean Tragedy.* London, 1904. p. 134.

3 Stoll, E. E., *Hamlet: An Historical and Comparative Study.* (Publications of the Univ. of Minnesota, VIII, 5) Minneapolis, 1919.

4 Lawrence, W. W., "The Play Scene in *Hamlet.*" JEGP 18:1-22 '19; esp. 1718.

5 Adams, J. Q. (ed.), *The Tragedy of Hamlet.* Boston, 1929. pp. 213-15.

6 Wilson, J. D., *What Happens in Hamlet.* Cambridge, 1935.

7 Keller, W., *Shakespeare Jahrbuch.* 1919, p. 152.

8 Van Dam, B. A. P., *The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet.* London, 1924. pp. 54ff.

9 Jones, H. M., *The King in Hamlet.* (Univ. of Texas Bulletin, no. 1865) Austin, Texas, 1918.

10 Baudin, M., "The Role of the Ghost in *Hamlet.*" Mod. Lang. Notes, 37:185-6, March, 1922.

1) About the first charge of hasty marriage there is and can be no disagreement. In the passage "A little month or ere those shoes were old" (I, ii, 147) Shakspere makes it clear that before the Ghost has appeared to Hamlet, the imagination of the prince, overwhelmed with grief and melancholy, is 'as foul as Vulcan's stithy' whenever he thinks of the 'wicked speed' in marriage of Gertrude and Claudius. Nowhere, it may be said, in the whole realm of dramatic literature has a sexual union ever been so loathsomely described as by Hamlet in his passages of vituperation in the closet scene (III, iv, 91-94; 182-4). Of Hamlet's many disgusts and disillusionments, this marriage of his mother with Claudius was the greatest. Gertrude herself, who shows a twinge of conscience about it as early as Act II, scene 2, suggests that it may be the cause of Hamlet's distemper.

> I doubt it is no other but the main;
> Hist father's death, and *our o'erhasty marriage.* (II, ii, 56-7)

Professor Jones urges in palliation that Claudius was legitimatizing an intrigue that could not have continued without scandal, and was also doing the honorable thing by Gertrude. Gertrude, however, is more candid than Professor Jones and plainly concedes the point.

2) The second charge, that this marriage was incestuous and, therefore, doubly sinful and repellant, is made repeatedly by both Hamlet and the Ghost. Professor Jones is in error in stating (p. 82) that only Hamlet offers this objection. The Ghost follows Hamlet's reference to "incestuous sheets" with:

> Ay, that incestuous, that adulterate beast. (I, v, 42)
> Let not the royal bed of Denmark be
> A couch for luxury and damn'd incést. I, v, 82-3)

Whatever may be our modern biological definition of incest, this union, according to the explicit teachings of the Church, whether Catholic or Protestant, was incestuous. Incest is one of the seven deadly sins. Professor Jones, recognizing that only a special dispensation would have permitted Claudius to marry Gertrude, assumes that he obtained one, and thus formed with her a hasty but valid union, accepted as such by the clergy, the court, and the

kingdom. This ingenious explaining away of incest, of course, wants evidence in the text of the play. Neither the Ghost nor Hamlet apparently had heard of this dispensation!

3) The third charge, adultery, was unknown to Hamlet until apprised of it by the Ghost. Professor Jones has no doubts on this point. The Ghost calls Claudius not merely an incestuouos, but an adulterate beast, and explicitely states that his brother seduced his Queen:

> With witchcraft of his wit, with traitorous gifts—
> O wicked wit and gifts, that have the power
> So to seduce—won to his shameful lust
> The will of my most seeming-virtuous queen. (I, v, 43-5)

Van Dam contends, however, that the word 'adultery' in Elizabethan and Shaksperian usage meant unchaste or lewd rather than unfaithful to the marriage bed, that Claudius, merely by persuading Gertrude to marry him, seduced her to shameful lust and incest. Unfortunately Van Dam loses sight of the fact that the Ghost said that Claudius won to his lust my *seeming-virtuous* queen. Gertrude could not have appeared as a dissembler to her first husband, had he not been aware during his lifetime of Claudius's lustful seduction of his wife. The old Hamlet story was explicit on this point: even before Fengon (=Claudius) "had any violent or bloody hands, or had once committed parricide upon his brother, he had incestuously abused his wife." The shameful conduct of Geruth (=Gertrude) while her first husband was still alive "made divers men think that she had been the cause of the murder, thereby to live in her adultery without control."[11] This additional sin serves to plunge Hamlet into deeper melancholy; he now inveighs against his mother as a "most pernicious woman". In spite of the Ghost's solemn injunction not to contrive against her, Hamlet persists in tenting her to the quick in the Play scene; nor in the Closet scene does he cease berating her until he has charged her with committing

> Such an act
> That blurs the grace and blush of modesty,
> Calls virtue hypocrite, takes off the rose

[11] Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

From the fair forehead of an innocent love,
And sets a blister there; makes marriage vows
As false as dicers' oaths: O! such a deed
As from the body of contraction plucks
The very soul, and sweet religion makes
A rhapsody of words:

. . . . . .

O shame! where is thy blush? Rebellious hell,
If thou cans't mutine in a matron's bones,
To flaming youth let virtue be as wax,
And melt in her own fire: proclaim no shame
When the compulsive ardour gives the charge,
Since frost itself as actively doth burn,
And reason panders will. (III, iv, 4off)

This is a pointed reiteration of her immodesty and her lustful nature; and the allusion to the breach of her marriage vows, and to her having by the "act" broken her "contraction" and destroyed the sacrament of marriage, admits of only one interpretation, adultery. Moreover, she confesses the truth of these accusations:

O Hamlet, speak no more;
Thou turns't mine eyes into my very soul,
And there I see such black and grainëd spots
As will not leave their tinct. (III, iv, 88-91)

Even after the Ghost has told Hamlet to "step between her and her fighting soul" he continues his denunciations, until he extracts from her two promises: to abstain from further intercourse with Claudius, and to keep from him Hamlet's secret of feigned madness. Subsequently Hamlet tells Horatio that the King "whor'd my mother". (V, ii, 64). Of Gertrude's sin of adultery there surely should be no further valid doubt.

4) As far back as 1856, C. Soames wrote the most careful study yet made on the question of the Queen's guilt in the murder.[12] Coleridge, as we have seen, merely raised the question whether she knew of it, but Dowden, Herford and others suspect her of complicity. In Q1 (1603) when Hamlet accuses her of killing her first husband she vows:

But as I have a soule, I sweare by heaven,
I never knew of this most horride murder. (Furness II, p. 72, lines 1531-3)

---

12 Soames, C., *Hamlet, An Attempt to Ascertain whether the Queen were an Accessory before the Fact, in the murder of her First Husband.* London, 1856.

In Q2 (1604) and F1 (1623), however, she merely exclaims, in utter astonishment at his charge:

Hamlet. Almost as bad, good mother,
As kill a king and marry with his brother.
Queen. As kill a King?

We should realize that Hamlet, though pierced by the revelation of his mother's adultery, was left in doubt whether she was also an accomplice in the murder. "It is most natural," says Soames, "that his jaundiced frame of mind should lead him to exaggerate the sin of his mother; and that, knowing her infidelity, he should go on to entertain gloomy fears as to her freedom from blood-guilt."[13] The Ghost had made no such accusation, had given Hamlet no evidence whether she was guiltless or guilty, but had strictly enjoined him in carrying out his task not to contrive aught against her. Claudius's crime of murder was to be revenged by death; Gertrude's sin of adultery was to be expiated by the pangs of conscience, which, though deeply buried, were not extinct. Why should the Ghost have been so considerate of his Queen throughout the play, if she had taken part in his death?

In his subsequent doubts, however, of the Ghost's genuineness, Hamlet, instead of sweeping to the revenge, feels the necessity of satisfying himself on both points—of discovering whether the Queen, as well as Claudius, is guilty of the murder. The speeches of the Player Queen are carefully contrived for this purpose. The theme of infidelity is repeatedly emphasized but the charge of murder also is twice insinuated, and openly made later in the closet scene; and on all three occasions with special emphasis upon the word *kill:*

Player Queen: In second husband let me be accurst.
None wed the second but who *kill'd the first.*
(III, ii, 191-2)

As Wilson says: "The reference is carefully confined to the Queen; it is wives, and not second husbands, which are hinted at as possible murderers."[14] At this direct insinuation Hamlet exclaims:

Wormwood, wormwood.

---

[13] Soames, *op. cit.,* p. 18.
[14] Wilson, *op. cit.,* p. 189.

The Player Queen, continuing, repeats:

> A second time I *kill* my husband dead
> When second husband kisses me in bed. (III, ii, 196-7)

Does Hamlet succeed in tenting his mother to the quick with these two insinuations, followed by his ironical comments of "wormwood," and "Madam, how like you this play?" (III, ii, 41). The Queen, innocent of the murder, but embarrassed by the obvious parallel of the Player Queen to her own situation, answers:

> The lady doth protest too much, methinks. (III, ii, 242....

After Hamlet's retort, "O, but she'll keep her word," he turns his attention to Claudius, who has perceived the significance of what is unfolding and is growing uneasy. When, on the talk of the poisoning, the King can contain himself no longer and rises, the Queen is surprised. Her exclamation, "How fares my lord?" shows that she had not comprehended Hamlet's drift, or caught the significance of the murder of the Player King by poison. She is not, therefore, as some critics have assumed, an accessory to the murder, nor does she know anything about it.

Hamlet, however, is still in a quandary; her uneasiness, though countered by apparent innocence at the play, still admits of doubt, and he goes to her bedroom, determined to be cruel, but not unnatural, to "speak daggers, but use none." The moment he has slain Polonius, Hamlet answers his mother's reproach:

> O, what a rash and bloody deed is this! (III, iv, 27)

by a third challenge,—this time an open accusation of murder:

> A bloody deed! almost as bad, good mother,
> *As kill a King,* and marry with his brother. (III, iv, 28-9)

The Queen, by her exclamation of utter surprise:

> As kill a King? (III, iv., 30)

reveals again her total ignorance of the crime, and Hamlet, at last convinced of her innocence of the murder, never makes the charge again, nor does he reveal to her what the Ghost told him. Had Hamlet gone on to explain to her the crime of Claudius, she perforce would have turned against her royal lord.

We find the critics at odds again on the further question of her loyalties in Acts IV and V. Soames states that after the Closet scene Gertrude sided wholly with Hamlet. Baudin, however, maintains the exact contrary, that Hamlet "lost his audience"—that the Queen, convinced of Hamlet's madness, as he conversed with "vacancy" and "incorporal air", believed him insane and henceforth "in her fear of the mad man, sided with Claudius."[15] He further asserts that the speech of the Queen, "What shall I do?" (III, ii, 180), is not addressed to Hamlet, since "one does not ask advice of the insane". This is obviously a wrong interpretation. The Queen's question *is* assuredly addressed to Hamlet, for he immediately responds with a long speech of specific advice, which, so far as we know, she followed:

Queen. What shall I do?
Ham. Not this, by no means, that I bade you do:
Let the bloat king tempt you again to bed . . . (III, iv, 181ff)

Baudin's argument, moreover, completely neglects the remainder of the Closet scene in which Hamlet prevents his mother from laying to her soul "the flattering unction" that he is mad. It neglects the promise that the Queen gives Hamlet not to betray him to Claudius—a promise she faithfully keeps.[16] It is most important, however, to realize that both critics are wrong. The Queen characteristically is henceforth loyal, so far as she can be, to both Hamlet and Claudius—she carries out Hamlet's injunction of secrecy, she defends him by giving the King an erroneous account of the Closet scene (IV, i, 7ff; 24ff), she tells the King that her son "weeps for what is done,"—immediately, too, after Hamlet's sardonic, "I'll lug the guts into the neighbor room." On the other hand, when Laertes bursts like a bombshell upon the King, demanding revenge for his father, she intercepts Laertes, and leaps to the defense of Claudius:

Laer. Where is my father?
King. Dead.
Queen. But not by him. (IV, v, 126)

There is no evidence, however, as Baudin contends, that

[15] Baudin, *op. cit.*, p. 186.
[16] Stoll, *op. cit.*, p. 44. "Dimly suspect as she may, she never learns of the murder; and while she keeps the secret of Hamlet's sanity and his hatred of the King, she is not disloyal to her lord." Similarly Jones, H. M., *op. cit.*, p. 71. "Not only is Gertrude no murderess; there is not a scintilla of evidence to show that she knew that old Hamlet was murdered, much less that Claudius killed him."

she has completely "sided with Claudius". On the contrary, Claudius notices that Gertrude has grown increasingly solicitous for Hamlet. To Laertes he says:

> The Queen his mother
> Lives almost by his looks. (IV, vii, 11-12)

Furthermore, her conscience, which was first shown alive in Act II, and which Hamlet tortured in Act III, continues to trouble her:

> *Queen.* *(aside)* To my sick soul, as sin's true nature is,
> Each toy seems prologue to some great amiss:
> So full of artless jealousy is guilt,
> It spills itself in fearing to be spilt. (IV, v, 17ff)

At Ophelia's grave she expresses regret that the love of Hamlet and Ophelia came to naught; moreover, she skilfully defends Hamlet's raving at the grave by an eloquent description of how Hamlet's mad moods come and go (V, i, 307ff). Nowhere is there a shred of evidence that she has betrayed Hamlet, and "has sided with Claudius," or that she is cognizant in any way either of the King's fratricide or of his continued nefarious plotting with Laertes. In the final scene she has little to say. A lord brings her request that Hamlet apologize to Laertes before they fall to play (V, ii, 215ff). She expresses her last concern for Hamlet's hard breathing in the fencing match and "carouses to his fortune" with the poisoned cup—actions incompatible with Baudin's contention that she "sided with Claudius" after the Closet scene.

In conclusion we may say that a careful reading of the text reveals the Queen guilty of the first three charges: hasty marriage, incest, adultery. She is innocent, however, throughout the play of any knowledge of the murder of Hamlet's father. The Queen is not an accomplice in the sources of the story; the Ghost ascribes his death to Claudius only; the King never exchanges confidences with the Queen as an accomplice in the murder; what uneasiness the Queen shows in the play is amply accounted for by her adultery, her hasty, incestuous marriage, her grief over Hamlet's madness, and her undoubted affection for both him and Claudius. Moreover, she makes no such charges against herself in her conscience-stricken confessions and asides.

Hamlet makes no such accusation to his confidant Horatio. Finally, Hamlet, who is solely responsible for the charge, drops it as soon as his suspicions are allayed.

As for Hamlet himself, if he was inept and dilatory, as many critics—Bradley, Adams and Wilson—contend, in revenging the Ghost and dispatching the bloat King's body, he did succeed in what evidently seemed to him a task of far more interest and importance, namely, in catching the conscience, not only of the King, whom we see futilely agonizing in prayer, but also of the Queen, whose heart is cleft in twain. In spite of the dread command of the Ghost, Hamlet, for good or for ill, refused to leave these problems of the soul to the powers of Heaven; he spent all his main efforts in Act III as a most skilful, a most persistent, and a most triumphant contriver against the souls of both Claudius and his Queen.

Lehigh University,
Bethlehem, Pa.

THE COSTUMES OF *LOVE'S LABOR'S LOST, TWELFTH NIGHT,* AND *THE TEMPEST*

By BERNICE FREEMAN

The problem of costume in Shakspere's plays or the plays of his contemporaries is a peculiar one. Just what the actual practice in the matter of costuming was is not fully understood. It is safe to say, however, that it was neither constant nor consistent. Granville-Barker points out that it was based upon the use of the clothes of the time, but that these might be freely and fantastically adapted to suit a particular play or some character in it.[1] Dramatic effect was probably the first consideration always. There were such fancy dresses as Oberon or Puck or Caliban might wear; there was always the symbolizing of royalty; a king would wear a crown whenever he could. There was the utility of knowing Romans from Britons by sight in *Cymbeline,* the martial Roman from the effete Egyptian in *Antony and Cleopatra,* and a Scottish lord at sight in *Macbeth,* as we may judge from Malcolm's comment upon Ross's appearance,

> "My countryman; and yet I know him not."

Ernest Law states that the records of the Revels prove that, contrary to the too generally accepted opinion, a great deal of care was devoted in all dramatic representations to accuracy in costume, so as to make it accord with the nationality as well as with the rank, profession, or station of each character. Not only were the ancients dressed in classical or "antick" attire, but Venetians wore their "Venetian weed" and senators and councillors the robes appropriate to their offices; while "Almains", "Turks", "Moors", "Patricians" and such like appeared in distinctive "garments, vestures and apparell."[2] Law further states that although Shakspere and his fellow actor-managers were not as scrupulously archæalogical in dressing as are our present-day stage artists, they strove after the greatest possible correctness with such knowledge and means as they had at their their disposal. For this purpose there was available an enormous assortment of material in the charge

---

[1] Harvey Granville-Barker, *Prefaces to Shakespeare* (London, 1927), p. xxxii-xxxvii.

[2] Ernest Law, *Shakespeare's 'Tempest' as Originally Produced at Court,* p. 19.

of the Master of the Revels, called by him "sundry garments of the store of the office." These were at the disposal of Shakspere's company and were constantly being altered and translated to supplement its own scarcely less rich and ample wardrobe. Also, individual actors had their private wardrobes.[3]

Harold Child says that "for the most part, the players wore the ordinary dress of the day, some, even of the male characters, appearing in wigs, and some, especially, it would seem, in cases of disguise or of minor players acting more than one part, having their faces concealed by masks. Henslolwe's extant accounts show that the costumes were splendid and costly—velvet, gold lace, copper lace, and other rich materials being freely used."[4]

Henry Peacham's illustration of *Titus Andronicus,* reprinted by Chambers in *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems,* drawn in 1595, is valuable in suggesting the types of costumes used in an early production of that play. Here it appears that some attempt was made to have the principal characters dress in the costumes of the period of the play, while the minor ones wore the ordinary Elizabethan dress.[5]

Thorndike[6] points out that the best plays from which to get an idea of the resources of the stage in the way of unusual costumes and properties are Heywood's *Four Ages.* A few stage-directions will indicate what the stage man-

[3] In *Henslowe's Diary* II, 130, W. W. Greg says:
"The wardrobe of a company appears to have been a complicated affair; part, like the stage properties, belonged to the company in general, that is to say, was the common property of the sharers, while part belonged to individual actors. Thus, on the one hand, we find Pembroke's men pawning their 'parel in 1593 (MS. 1, 14) and Edward Alleyn buying Jones' share in the common stock of 'playing apparrelle' &c, belonging to Worcester's men in 1589 (MS. 1, 2) . . . . Again, on the one hand, we have Edward Alleyn's list of what was apparently his own private wardrobe (MS. 1, 30) and Henslowe's inventory of the Company's stock (Apx. I, 1) taken in 1598."
Also see *Henslowe's Diary* (London, 1904-08) I, 29, 47, 81, 96, 118, 124, 136, 138, 144, 146, 153.

[4] "The Elizabethan Theatre", *CHEL,* VI (1910), p. 271. Also see Greg: *Henslowe's Diary* I, 81, 96, 118, 136, 138, 144, 153, 166.

[5] Titus' costume somewhat resembles that of a Roman general, while that of Tamora has certain characteristics of the dress of the women of Gaul, noticeably the long tunic reaching to the ankles. The arrangement of the hair is also Gallic, as it falls loosely over the shoulders. The other costumes resemble those of Elizabeth's day. Even the implements of war, swords and axes, are Elizabethan.

[6] *Shakespeare's Theatre* (New York, 1916) p. 135.

agers could do when they aimed at a spectacular performance.

> "Pluto drawes hell: the Fates put upon him a burning Roobe, and present him with a mace and a burning crowne."[7]
>
> "Two fiery buls are discovered, the Fleece hanging over them and the Dragon sleeping beneath them; Medea with strange fiery-workers, hangs above in the aire in the strange habit of a conjuresse."[8]
>
> "Enter Aeneas with his father, who taking Choreleas for a Crecian by reason of his habits, fights with him and kils him."[9]

From the first two of the above directions we see something of the elaborateness of the stage effects. There seems little doubt but that most of the characters wore the ordinary dress of the day, yet that in itself was very elaborate, particularly in the case of the members of the nobility. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*[10] describes the Renaissance characteristic dress of the man of fashion as consisting of the doublet, hose, and cape. The stockings reached from the waist to the toe; the doublet was a close-fitting garment with or without sleeves which reached from the neck to the waist; the cape, a relic of the ancient flowing robe, hung across the back and served chiefly for ornament. Both men and women of fashion wore a stiffly starched ruff or collar reaching from the shoulder to the ear. Men's sleeves were puffed out until no one could tell the shape of the arm; the hose were padded from the thigh to the knee, and the doublet was likewise generously stuffed. The whole suit was made of rich satins and velvets of many different colors. Jewels were often worked into the cloth, so that enormous fortunes could be spent on clothing.

Dickinson, in the University of Wisconsin *Shakespeare Studies*,[11] thinks that Shakspere was willing, whenever possible to use the tricks of costume and the appeals of display rather than to depend on poetic description, believing the effect of sight to be more immediate. Dickinson continues by saying that Shakspere used these effects not only for spectacle but also dramatically. The result of this study

---

[7] The individual play, *The Golden Age.*
[8] The individual play, *The Brazen Age.*
[9] *Iron Age,* Part II.
[10] Ed. 14, VII, 654.
[11] Thomas H. Dickinson, "Some Principles of Shakespeare Staging;" *Shakespeare Studies* (Madison, 1916), p. 129.

seems to show that as Shakspere developed as a playwright he showed an increasing willingness to use the tricks of costume and the appeals of display. There is nothing outstanding about the costumes of *Love's Labor's Lost* other than that they were probably very elaborate. Most of the costuming of *Twelfth Night* is simple, although it is more vitally integrated with the plot than in the first play, particularly Malvolio's yellow stockings and cross garters, Viola's disguise, and Feste's costume as Sir Topas. *The Tempest* is both elaborate and spectacular in the matter of costume. It requires a great display of wealth in the costumes of the king and his court and in the "glittering apparel" brought on by Ariel. In addition it calls for Prospero's magic robes, Ariel's airy clothes, his outfit as a harpy and as a sea nymph, his invisible robe, the dresses of the goddesses of the masque, the attire of the strange shapes that brought in the banquet, and, above all, Caliban's bearskin and gaberdine.[12]

References to clothing occur in *Love's Labor's Lost* perhaps less than in either *Twelfth Night* or *The Tempest.* Those that do appear are not greatly important, but, then, the costuming of *Love's Labor's Lost* is not particularly difficult. The main characters appear in courtly apparel. The king probably wore his crown in the first scene. No doubt, the princess was identified as a member of the royalty by her dress. She could have been much more elaborately clad than her ladies in attendance; and since it had already been stated that the Princess of France was expected, the mere richness of her costume might designate her as such. The dress of the ladies of the court in Elizabeth's day was as elaborate as that of the men, being made of varicolored satins and velvets and beaded with jewels. Miss Linthicum's observations on oes[13] give an idea of some of the gowns used in some Renaissance performances. She says, "Gowns embroidered all over with 'oes' of gold and silver" were used at the Oxford performance on the occasion of the visit of James I in August 1605. In Chapman's *Masque of the Inns of Court,* 1613, 'Honour' wore a 'vaile of net lawne'

[12] The traditional costume of Caliban is a bearskin over which a gaberdine is thrown. Law, *Shakespeare's 'Tempest' as Originally Produced at Court,* p. 19.

[13] "Oes", *RES,* VII, (April, 1931) p. 198.

embroidered 'with Oes and spangled'; and the lords who took part in Jonson's *Masque of Hymen,* 1616, wore mantles embroidered with oes. "Oes were small circular spangles used to ornament dress." Lord Howard's household accounts show that about 1620 copper as well as precious metals was used in making oes. These ornaments were attractive for stage costumes because they showed to advantage in the light. Just how elaborate the clothes of these lords and ladies were as they appeared in this pastoral setting, it is impossible to determine. Since there was so little else in this play to appeal to the audience, I see no reason to deny them the attraction of costumes. The lord's dress was probably very similar to the outfit of the man of fashion described above. The clown, no doubt, wore the fool's conventional motley, while Jaquenetta was probably identified as a country wench by her dress. The clown's outfit worn by Tarlton is described on page 114 of the Shakspere Association's *Shakespeare and the Theatre* as being that of "a rogue in a foule shirt without a band, and in a blew coat with one sleeve, his stockings out at the heeles, and his head full of straw and feathers". Kemp's was probably on that order. The others were probably dressed according to the conventional costume of their profession—the curate, the schoolmaster, the forester and the page. Armado was certainly arrayed in the current Spanish fashion, with his sword sparkling at his side.

Several definite references to the costumes of the characters are found in this play. In Act II, scene 1, Longaville speaking of Maria says,

> "What is she in the *white?*"[14]

Evidently Maria was dressed in white, or else she wore a favor of white, by which she could be designated. Speaking of Katherine, Biron says,

> What's her name, in the *cap?*"[15]

Moth, speaking to Armado, says,

> "With your *hat* penthouse-like, o'er the shape of your eyes; with your arms crossed on your thin belly's *doublet* . . . your hands in your pockets."[16]

[14] Line 196.
[15] Line 208.
[16] Act III, Scene 1, lines 15-16.

Costard, speaking to the princess, says,

"One of these maids' *girdles* for your waist should be fit."[17]

Such lines as these are all that we have from which to build our concept of clothes worn in this play. Other costumes were put on, as costumes, by the king and his lords as they masqueraded as Russians. Rosaline describes their disguises as "shapeless gear". Later when they return she says to Biron,

"Which of the visors was it, that you wore?"[18]

which gives us some idea of the nature of the disguise.

The Worthies appeared in armor. It was the custom in presenting the Nine Worthies to show "3 Assaralits, 3 Infidels, 3 Christians."[19] All of them did not appear, but it seems that different costumes had been planned for each because the king, having read the program, says,

"And if these four worthies in their first show thrive,
These four will change habits, and present the other five."[20]

There is a suggestion of the use of a wig found in Act IV, scene I. Dumaine, in speaking of Katherine, says,

"Her amber hairs for foul have amber quoted."[21]

If the boy playing Katherine's part did not have amber hair he would have to wear a wig, and yet it is quite likely that all of the boys wore wigs. There is no reason why they should not, particularly since it was a fashion at court to wear them.

The fact that the ladies wore masks at times should be noted, although masks were regular parts of a lady's costume in that day. In fact, they were about as customary and necessary for a lady of fashion as a sword was for a man.

In this play Shakspere has made no particular use of costume as a dramatic device. The splendor of the suits did

[17] Act IV, Scene 1, line 50.
[18] Act V, Scene 2, line 387.
[19] Furness, *The Variorum of Shakespeare's "Love's Labor's Lost"*, (1904) p. 283. By Assaralits it is probable that Israelites are meant, since a list of the Nine Worthies, generally includes three Jewish warriors of fame—Joshua, David, and Judas Maccabeus.
[20] Act V, Scene 2, line 537.
[21] Line 82.

add to the spectacular elements, but other than that it has no essential part in the play. In *Twelfth Night,* however, the subplot is built almost entirely around Malvolio's stockings and garters. They certainly produce the unit around which the two plots are linked. Costumes play an even more important part than dramatic unity in *Twelfth Night.* They serve to identify the characters and to connect the scenes of the story. The device of disguise is the basis even for the main plot.

At the beginning of *Twelfth Night* music is heard offstage. Presently Orsino is discovered in his chair of state. He is a man of authority, as may be inferred from the Gentlemen in attendance, all of whom are in courtly apparel, but the greater dignity of Orsino's costume distinguishes him as a lord or duke. The very short first scene passes without mentioning the nobleman's name or his real title. In fact, almost nothing of the plot is told other than that this gentleman is in love with the lady Olivia. At the beginning of Scene 2, a lady (her social standing is designated by her clothing) enters, accompanied by several sailors and a sea-captain. The latter are also identified by their clothes. From the conversation we discover that the richly clad nobleman of the first scene was Orsino, the Duke of Illyria. After planning to disguise herself as a boy, the lady, whose name we have not yet heard, proceeds with the sea-captain to the palace of Orsino. In the next scene we are introduced to the interior of Olivia's house. Sir Toby, the bulky uncle of Olivia, calls attention to his clothes by saying,

> "These clothes are good enough to drink in; and so be these boots too, and they be not, let them hang themselves in their own straps."[22]

He says in the first sentence that he is Olivia's uncle, but it is Maria's dress that first informs us that she is the lady-in-waiting. At the opening of Scene 4 two people in men's attire enter. One of them looks very much like the lady we had seen on the sea-coast with the captain. Since that lady had planned to disguise herself as a boy and serve Orsino, and since Valentine, the other character, says,

[22] Act I, Scene 3, lines 10-13.

> "If the duke continues these favors towards you, Cesario, you are like to be much advanced; *he hath known you but three days.*"[23]

we gather that this is the lady and that she is to be known at court as 'Cesario.' No other name is given her until the last act. The matter of costume, then, plays an important part in getting the story under way.

The main plot then centers around the fact that since Viola is in man's attire she is mistaken for a man and loved by Olivia, while Viola herself loves Orsino, who does not return her affection because he thinks she is a man. The twin brother of Viola is then produced, who not only looks just like her, but is clad in the identical manner so that the one is mistaken for the other by persons who had seen that other only a very few minutes before. Something of the social standing of Sebastian may be gained from the fact that he is clad in a manner courtly enough to be acceptable to Orsino as the style of dress fit for his favorite attendant. That in itself, without the verbal assertions of the play, would make it clear that Olivia did not stoop to a class lower than her own when she married Sebastian.

Olivia's costume was, of course, very elaborate. There is no hint of her mourning for her brother's death in her costume. It is certain that she wore at least one ring, for she took one off to give Malvolio as she sent him after Viola. Both Olivia and Orsino were surrounded by attendants in the customary court apparel. The clothes of Sir Toby and Sir Andrew, in addition to being rather shabby and ill cared for, no doubt placed them on a rather lower social level than the characters already mentioned, except the seamen, of course. Sebastian's friend, Antonio, was dressed in the manner typical of the middle-class citizen. The officers were in their uniform. Feste wore the customary clown's outfit. The priest was recognized by his robe. The only other character of importance is Malvolio, and it was his costume that "made" the sub-plot.

Concerning the "yellow stockings" and "cross garters" Miss Linthicum says,[24]

[23] Act I, Scene 4, lines 1-4.
[24] "Malvolio's Cross-Gartered Yellow Stockings", *MP*, XXV (1927) 87.

> "The effect of Malvolio's costume upon Olivia is unusual and not to be wholly accounted for by the fact that yellow is 'a colour she abhors', and 'cross-garter'd a fashion she detests.' Nor would her letter and her suposed commendation of this costume have given Malvolio the temerity to speak as he does at their meeting if the cross-gartered yellow stockings had no meaning in themselves."

Four explanations of the significance of Malvolio's dress have been offered: (1) yellow, especially in stockings, was the court fashion of the time, (2) yellow signified Malvolio's attempt to appear young, (3) it was the symbol of jealousy, (4) cross-gartering expressed Malvolio's puritanism. After discussing the probabilities of the different points, Miss Linthicum concludes,

> "A consideration of the evidence in *Twelfth Night* eliminates the probability of Malvolio's costume having any meaning except those of puritanism, courtly affectation, or love. He could hardly have considered that Olivia would admire puritanical insignia. If he had worn them continually, as a courtier, she would not have been shocked at his appearance. On the other hand, he expressly states: 'She did commend my yellow stockings of late, she did praise my leg being cross-garter'd, *and in this she manifests herself to my love.*' Malvolio, in view of 'such clear lights of favor,' therefore considered himself an accepted lover, and appeared before his lady wearing a lover's costume and smiling as he had been enjoined to do. Olivia, at first astonished at the significance of his dress, was outraged by his talk, and concluding that he was insane, had him imprisoned."[25]

Such an explanation of the meaning of Malvolio's costume certainly increases the importance of his part in the play. Students have been puzzled to learn why the character of Malvolio was so enthusiastically received by the Elizabethans. The fact that it was so received is evidenced by the number of times that *Twelfth Night was* referred to as "Malvolio" or "The Play of Malvolio." Perhaps the meaning of his costume, as explained by Miss Linthicum, had a great deal to do with that.

Feste's donning the gown and beard in order to impersonate Sir Topas shows an interest in costume. Maria says that they are unnecessary because Malvolio cannot see them. Yet there is the assumption on the part of the actors that with the gown and beard Feste will look enough like Sir

---

[25] *Ibid*, p. 90.

Topas to be taken for him. The presence of the beard also shows that the company possessed one, that it was probably used in every play that called for an old man. The gown gives some idea of the type of garment worn by a curate.

It is impossible to determine just which characters wore wigs and which did not; however, in the conversation between Sir Toby and Sir Andrew in Act I, Scene 3, it seems probable that Sir Andrew is wearing one. Surely his own hair would not allow the description given by Sir Toby. Sir Toby says, line 108,

> "Excellent: it hangs like flax on a distaff; and I hope to see a housewife take thee between her legs and spin it off."

Olivia's veil, put on and removed in Act I, Scene 5, was a necessary part of a lady's dress when she appeared before strangers. Of course, all the men wore swords, and had only to draw them to be ready to fight.

Costuming, then, plays an essential part in the plots of *Twelfth Night,* and in some ways was the most outstanding part of the play. In *The Tempest* the costumes are just as essential, but in an entirely different way. There is no connection with the plot; yet the atmosphere that makes the play could not be achieved without Prospero's magic robes, Ariel's airy costume, Caliban's bearksin, etc. The costumes in *The Tempest* are much more spectacular than anything we have seen in the other plays. They certainly point toward an hypothesis that Shakspere showed an increasing tendency to use costume dramatically.

Unlike those of *Twelfth Night, costumes* play no essential part in the identification of characters in this play. In the first line the boatswain is addressed. He answers "Here, master," thus identifying the first speaker. The mariners are mentioned before they enter, and the king and his court have hardly been on deck a minute before the boatswain yells out,

> "What cares these roarers for the name of king?"[26]

The appropriate costuming of this scene, however, contributes much to obtaining the atmosphere of a sea scene.

[26] Line 19.

In fact, the scene could hardly be successful unless the mariners were nautically clad. Law feels sure that Alonso and his followers were dressed in the Italian fashion, and not in the fashion of the English of James's Court.[27] It is quite possible that they were, although no line of the text suggests this definitely. The garments were not spoiled in the storm, at any rate, because Ariel in recounting the events to Prospero says,

> "On their sustaining garments not a blemish
> But fresher than before."[28]

Gonzalo also comments on the freshness of their garments, in Act II, Scene 1. These costumes were probably as elaborate as the company could offer on any occasion. The royal party was just returning from the marriage of the king's daughter where, of course, all the finery which could be amassed by the courtiers would be worn. From the viewpoint of the play as a whole, also, it seems that no effort would be spared to add to the spectacular effect.

We get hints of Prospero's costume from the text and stage-directions, such as "pluck my magic garment from me", *"Resumes his mantle"*, *"Enter Prospero in his magic robes"*. These "magic" garments were probably made of rich materials highly embroidered in rich colors and queer designs, which in themselves held an air of mystery. One indication of the peculiarity of the magic robes is the fact that Prospero was not recognized while he wore them. In Act V, scene 1, he says,

> "Not one of them
> That yet looks on me, or would know me: Ariel,
> Fetch me the hat and rapier in my cell;
> I will discase me, and myself present
> As I was sometime Milan: quickly, spirit;
> Thou shalt ere long be free."

It is only after Prospero has attired himself in his former clothes that Alonso, Gonzalo, and Sebastian recognize him.

Several textual references to Trinculo indicate that he was dressed in the conventional motley of the fool. Caliban addresses him as the "jesting monkey". Other significant

---

[27] *Shakespeare's 'Tempest' as Originally Produced at Court*, p. 19.
[28] Act I, Scene 2, lines 217-18.

references to him are, "What a pied ninny's this" and "Thou scurvey patch!"[29]

Stephano's outfit as a butler presented nothing unusual.

Caliban, as a savage and deformed slave, was probably quite an accomplishment in the way of make-up and costuming.[30]. His clothing seems to have been traditionally a "bear skin" and over it the gabardine which Trinculo creeps under to shelter himself from the storm, and which Cotgrave defines as "a cloake of Felt for rainie weather."[31] Perhaps his deformity was made obvious by queer-shaped shoes, a "hump" for his back or some other odd device. He is referred to several times as a monster—fish-like and freckled. Concerning him Trinculo says,

> "A strange fish. Were I in England now, as once I was and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver . . . legged like a man! and his fins like arms."[32]

The most interesting problem of costuming in the entire play is that of Ariel with his different impersonations. Concerning him Law says,

> What his dress was on the night in question we may gather in a general way from Inigo Jones's sketch, now preserved at Chatsworth, of a costume for an 'Aery Spirit' in some play or masque, and from Ben Jonson's description of a very similar costume for 'Jophiel, an Airy Spirit,' in his masque of *The Fortunate Isles,* acted in 1626. These two authorities taken together suggest a close-fitting tunic of silk in rainbow colours, wings tinctured in harmony with it, a scarf over his shoulders, buskins or blue silk stockings, and on his head a chaplet of flowers—not unlike the costume worn by Charles I when, as Duke of York, and only eleven years old, he acted the character of Zephirus in Daniel's *'Tethy's Festival'*—presented the year before *The Tempest* on the same spot in the Banqueting House—to wit, green satin, embroidered with golden flowers, with silver wings and a garland of flowers on his head."[33]

Ariel as a sea-nymph was probably clad in loose flowing garments, perhaps of light green. The sketches of various "nymphs" by Inigo Jones suggest a resemblance to any

[29] Law, *op. cit.,* p. 19.

[30] Lawrence states that grease paints were as well known to the Shaksperian actor as to a modern one.

[31] See Law, *op. cit.,* p. 19.

[32] Act II, Scene 2, line 29 ff.

[33] *op. cit.,* p. 20.

décolleté Jacobean lady. There seems to be no evidence that the costume suggested anything like our modern conception of a sea nymph. In Act III, Scene 2, we have the direction *"Enter Ariel, like a harpy; claps his wings upon the table; and with a quaint device, the banquet vanishes."* Harpies, as described by Vergil in the third book of the *Aeneid,* were fierce winged monsters with virgin faces and claws for hands. Their skin was supposed to be very thick so that it could not be cut by a sword. Ariel probably wore a tangled wig, enormous feather wings and tail, with claw-shoes on his feet and claw-shaped gloves as well. His face and neck could have been masked to resemble the "fated skin" that was "proof to wounds." At any rate, his costume had the desired effect on his spectators who cried out,

"O, it is monstrous, monstrous.

The strange shapes that danced "with mocks and mows" were probably dressed after the manner of the American Indian. No doubt they were queerly painted so that they made a weird, enchanted appearance.[34]

In Act IV, Scene 1, the following direction appears, *"Enter certain Reapers, properly habited: they join with the Nymphs in a graceful dance."* The Italian fashion in the matter of reaper's costume would hardly be distinguishable from the English. The nymphs' garments were probably loose fitting robes.

Concerning the robes of the goddesses in the masque we may be sure they were very elaborate, as well as appropriate to the personages. Daniel, in the preface to his *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses,* describes the costumes of the goddesses in a way that might give us an idea of their appearance here. As described by him, Iris appeared 'deckt like a rainbow; Ceres in a straw-colour and silver embroidery, with ears of corne', and a head-dress of the same and carrying a sickle. Juno was attired in 'a skie colour mantle embroidered with gold and figured with peacock's feathers, wearing a crown of gold on her head,' set with jewelled stars, and carrying a scepter.

[34] R. M. Kelsey, "Indian Dances in *The Tempest*", *JEGP,* XIII (1914 98-103.

The glittering apparel brought on and spread out by Ariel, and later worn by Trinculo and Stephano, consisted in articles of "finery" brought from the costume room merely for the purpose of display. The garments with the most embroidery, or the brightest colors, or the most gold and silver spangles, etc., were, no doubt, the ones chosen.

One other garment should be mentioned, and that is the "robe to go invisible". We have no way of describing this bit of costume. The only reference to it that we have is the list giving its cost in *Henslowe's Dairy*.[35] Whatever it was like, it evidently served the purpose of informing the audience that the wearer was invisible to the other characters on the stage. Ariel wore such a robe most of the time he was on the stage. Prospero was supposedly invisible twice during the play.

Although Shakspere was always conscious of the "dressing" of his plays, the study of *Love's Labor's Lost, Twelfth Night,* and *The Tempest* shows that he, in these three plays at least, attached more importance to the matter of costuming as a means to an end toward the end of his career than at first. The "dressing" of *Love's Labor's Lost* contributed a pleasing finish to the completed play. In *Twelfth Night,* however, the play could not be what it is were it not for the mistaken conceptions gained by costuming. Although such a motive as a basis for a play is not the highest, idealistically, it is a neat dramatic device that had ample precedent. In *The Tempest,* however, Shakspere shows himself an even greater master of the art of "dressing" a play when he produces a play that is not vitally connected with the costumes of the characters, and yet a play that is dependent to a great extent upon appropriate costuming for its atmosphere; a play whose costuming must receive special attention if it is to be successfully produced, and a play that proves to be very spectacular by nature of its elaborate "dressing."

Chapel Hill,
North Carolina.

[35] See G. P. Baker, *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist* (New York, 1916) p. 71.

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

Occurring in the Bibliography of Elizabethan Topics published in 1935*

By S. A. TANNENBAUM

* Topics are printed in italics. Women's names are distinguished by a colon after the initial of the baptismal name. The bibliography covered by this Index was published in the January, 1936, issue of this BULLETIN. Titles of books are in italics and in single quotes. S=Shakspere; Sn=Shaksperian.

A

'Abraham & Isaac,' 8629
Abstracts of S's plays, 7952
Acting, Sn, 7953-59, 8637
Actors, Sn, 7953-59
Adaptations of S's plays, 7960-62, 8126
Adnès, A., 8358
Aetion, Identity of, 8699
Agate, J. E., 7956, 7978, 8419, 8515, 8579
Alexander, G., 7958
Alexander, P., 8422, 8424
'All's Well that Ends Well,' S's, 8395-96, 8818
Allen, D. C., 8382, 8384, 8598
Allen, H: E., 8287, 8312
Allen, P., 8389
Allen, S. P., 8076
Allison, L:, 8557
America, S in, 7963-64
Anders, H., 8204
Angeli, D., 8268
Anthologies, 7966-69
'Antony & Cleopatra,' S's, 8397
'Arden of Feversham,' A note on, 8398
Armenian criticism of S, 7970
Armour, R. W., 8091
Armstrong, T. P., 8674
Aronstein, P., 8691
Ashton, J. W., 8743
Askenov, I., 8671, 8673
'As You Like It,' S's, 7958, 8119, 8399-8401a, 8817
Atkins, R., 7957
Atkins, S. H., 8147, 8162, 8166, 8315
Atkinson, B., 8511, 8564
Audience, S's, 7970a
Auslander, J., 8005

B

Bacon, F., 8111, 8339, 8343
Bacon-Shake-Speare question, 7971-75
Baesecke, A:, 8248
Baker, H., 8297
Baker, J. E., 8438
Bakshy, 8639
Bald, R. C., 8102, 8230
Baldwin, T. W., 8203, 83228, 8636, 8693
Bales, P., 8682
Ball, R. H., 8348
Ballard, P. B., 8309
Balsdon, D., 8043
Banks, T. H., 8684
Bartlett, H: C., 8649
Bartlett, P:, 8047
Barton, L:, 8169
Baskervill, C. R., 8061, 8598
Baskerville, C. R., 8061, 8598
Baskervill, C. R., 8094
Bateson, F. W., 8298, 8422, 8593, 8604
Baugh, A. C., 8301
Baumgarten, E., 8404
Beatrice, 8531
Beatty, R. C., 7174, 7981, 8055, 8180, 8228, 8256, 8260, 8289, 8290, 8296, 8320, 8337, 8344, 8350, 8390, 8585, 8629, 8679, 8688, 8801
Beaumont & Fletcher, 7976-83
Beckingham, C. F., 8533
Bee lore, S's, 8045
Bell, D., 8106
Belloc, H., 8108
Belphegor, 8116
Bennett, J:, 8144
Bennet, J:, 8143
Bennett, J. W., 8718
Bennett, R. E., 8183
Bensly, E., 8123, 8291, 8300, 8379, 8503
Bentley, G. 9., 8057, 8189, 8786, 8789
Besterman, T., 7994
Betts, E., 8478
Bezushko, V., 8623
Bhattacherje, M., 8742
Bianquis, G:, 8338
Bible, The, and S, 7984, 8386

Bibliographies of S, 7985-94a, 8148, 8669
Biography of S, 7995-8000, 8321, 8624
Biro, L., 8478
Black, M. W., 8090
Boas, F. S., 7991, 8069, 8125, 8360
Boase, A. M., 8370, 8373
Boccaccio, 8271
Bodkin, M:, 8589, 8615
Bodley, J:, 8100
Boedtker, A. T., 8554
Bombast in S, 8305
Bond, D. F., 8591
Bond, R. W., 7979
Bonnard, G., 8588
Book titles from S, 8001-8043
Boon, F., 8009
Borgmann, A. S., 8336
Bosanquet, E. F., 8163
Botany and S, 8044-45
Botting, R. B., 8721
Boughner, D. G., 8505
Bowen, M:, 8755
Bowers, R. H., 8118
Boyce, B., 8181
Bradbrook, M: C., 7953, 7977, 8171, 8227, 8299, 8323, 8359, 8677, 8764, 8781, 8790, 8800
Bradner, L., 8733
Brandl, A., 8253, 8508
Brentano, L., 8024
Brett-James, N. G., 8318
Brettle, R. E., 8341
Bright, T., 8681-82
Brinig, M., 8040
Britten, N. A., 8151
Broadus, E. K., 8429
Brockington, A. A., 8592
Brooke, A., 8554
Brooke, C. F. T., 8808
Brown, B: D., 8510
Browning, R., 8187
Brulé, A., 8294
Brutus, S's, 8488
Bryskett, Lord, 8101
Buc, G., 8102
Buck, H., 8035
Buckingham, 8099
Buckminster, T., 8163
Budd, F. E., 8497
Bullen, A. H., 7976
Bullough, G., 8454
Buning, J. W. F., 8534
Burbage, R., 8110
Burke-Johnston, G., 8280
Burnshaw, S., 8062
Burton, R., 8165
Bush, D., 8379, 8807
Bush, R. B. J., 8752
Butler, C:, 8002
Butler, K. T., 8151
Byrom, H. J., 8135, 8632

C

'Caesar, Julius,' S's, 8485-88
Caesar, S's, 8487
Cain, H. E., 8723
Cairncross, A. S., 8541
Caliban, 8567
Cameron, K., 8378
Campbell, L: B., 8137
Campbell, O. J., 8401
Campbell, O. W., 8404
Campion, T., 8095
Canting terms, 8307
Carey, Lady, 8716
Case, A. E., 8148
Cecil, D., 8031
Cecil, W., 8109, 8115
Chadburn, P., 8628
Chambers, E. K., 8206, 8064
Chambrun, C: L., 7995, 8219
Chapman, G., 8046-51, 8132, 8342, 8503
Chapman, R. W., 8422
Charlton, H. B., 8156, 8461, 8516
Chartier, E., 8237, 8435
Chaucer, G., 8497
Chester, A. G., 8145, 8283
Chettle, H., 8052, 8132
Chew, S. C., 8308
Cheyney, E. P., 8481
Christian, M: G., 8362
Christy, R., 8641
Chukovskii, K., 8666
Churchyard, T., 8145
Cinema, S and the, 8053-53b
Clark, C. C., 8170, 8171a, 8216a, 8463
Clarke, A. H. T., 8395
Clarkson, P. S., 8561
Classicists, Elizabethan, 8155
Classics, The, and Elizabethan drama, 8054-55, 8811
Clemons, H., 8093
Coate, M., 7986
Coleridge, S. T., 8184

Collier, J. P., 8233
Collins, D. C., 8161
Colors in renaissance literature, 8154
Colson, P., 7959
Comedy, 8056-61b
'Comedy of Errors,' S's, 8402-03
Commentary on S, 8062-89a, 8119-20, 8242, 8624, 8811
Commentators, S's, 8090-94
Communist view of S, 8062
Contemporaries of S, 8095-8115, 8646
Conventional speech, 8299
Conventions, Acting, 7953, 8704
Cook, D., 8200
Cookman, A. V., 8751
'Coriolanus,' S's, 8404, 8750
Corneille, 8539
Cornell, K:, 8550, 8557
Cornwall, A. B., 7972
Cornwall, B., 8091
Costume, 8167-70
Cowl, R. P., 8469
Craig, H., 7989, 8049, 8080, 8412
Creelman, E:, 8525
Criticism, Anthology of, 7968
Critics of S., 8079
Croce, B., 8614
Cronyn, G., 8010
Crosse, G., 8201
Crundell, H. W., 8307, 8432, 8456, 8467, 8473a, 8490
Cummings, H., 8436
Cunliffe, J. W., 8808
Curry, W. C., 8508, 8573
Customs, Elizabethan, 8171-71a, 8213
'Cymbeline,' S's, 8405-06
Cyphers, 7973, 8222

D

Dallington, R., 8239
Dance, Elizabethan, 8172-74
Dane, C: (*pseud.*), 8022
Daniel, S., 7174a
Davenant, W., 7961, 8175-77, 8780
Davenport, A., 813 6
David, R., 8078, 8603, 8640, 8798
Davidsohn, R., 8814
Davies, E: H., 7962
Davies, J. D. G., 8472
Davis, B. E. C., 8705
Dawson, G. E., 7987, 8117
Day, J., 8178
Decroos, J., 8324, 8330
Deetjen, W., 8246a
Dekker, T., 8179-82
De La Mare, W., 8085
Delattre, F., 8089a
Deloney, T., 8631
Dentistry, S and, 8352
Derricke, J., 8101
Deutschbein, M., 8306
Devereux, P:, 8685
Devereux, R., 8112
Dickinson, A. D., 8231
Diction, Poetic, 8593
Digby, K., 8713
Dike, E. B., 8303
Dinamov, S., 8501a
Dobie, G. C., 8013
Dodd, W. M., 8656
Dodds, H. M., 8123, 8452-53, 8467
Don Marquis, 8457
Donne, J., 8183-87, 8143, 8314
Doran, M:, 8500
Douglas, M. W., 8387
Dowlin, C. M., 8176
Downs, H., 7957, 8076, 8638
Drake, F., 8106
Drama, 7952, 7966, 8066, 8188-95, 8242, 8248, 8271, 8770
Drama, Elizabethan, 8054, 8116-34, 8190, 8763-70, 8793
Draper, J. W., 8411, 8413, 8445, 8451, 8518
Drayton, M., 8196-98, 8699
Drew, E:, 8066, 8194, 8305, 8308, 8602, 8606
Drinkwater, J., 8763
Dryden, J., 8351
Du Jardin, R:, 8021
Dumbshow in 'Hamlet,' The, 8452, 8458
Dyer, E., 8142, 8146

E

Eccles, M., 8127, 8334
Eccles, M., 8328
Economics and S, 7970, 8518
Edgar, I. I., 8353, 8356, 8358a, 8644
Editing and Editors, Sn, 8199-8202a
Education, Elizabethan, 8203-05
Edwards, H. R. L., 8048
Edwards, R. D., 8264
Edwards, T., 8698
Ehrsam, T. G., 8622
Eidson, J. O., 8418
Elegy, Elizabethan, 8153
Elgar, E., 8375

Eliot, T. S., 8611, 8784
Elizabeth Queen, 8145, 8206-08, 8210, 8321, 8365, 8812, 8813
Elliott, S. H., 8659
Ellis-Fermor, U: M., 8782
Elson, J. J., 8462
Elton, O., 8074
England's Helicon, 8138, 8141
Environment, S's, 8209-17a
Ervine, St. J., 8545
Esthetics, 8071, 8072
Ethics and the Drama, 8049, 8803-04
Everett, A. L., 8474
'Everyman,' 8629
Ewen, C. L., 8381
Extracts from S, 7969, 8218

F

Fairy lore of S, 8045, 8079a
Falstaff, 8375, 8461, 8463, 8465-66, 8468, 8470
Farjeon, H., 7969, 8544
Faulkner, V:, 8028
Ferguson, O., 8525
Ferrabosco, A., 8103
Feste, 8401a
Fiction, S as a character in, 8219
Field, R., 7973
Fink, Z. S., 8399
Fisher, H: A. L., 8216
Fletcher, J. B., 8271
Florio, J., 8048, 8113, 8272
Flowers in S, 8045
Flynn, J. G., 8333
Flyting in S, 8815
Folios, The S, 8220-25
Folk-song, 8174
Fontanne, L:, 8564
Fools, 8226
Forbes-Robertson, Miss, as Viola, 8579
Ford, H. L., 7990
Ford, J., 8227-29
Forgeries, 8230-33, 8649, 8753
Forsythe, R., 8525
Fort, A: B., 7952
Fowler, E. B., 8703
Franz, W., 8486
French criticism of S, 8234-40
French, The, in S's plays, 8240
Freyd, B., 8727-28
Friedkina, L., 8491, 8494
Friendship, Elizabethan, 8719
Frizer, I., 8335
Frobisher, 8157
Furnas, C. C., 8018
Fucilla, J. G., 8152
Fukuda, I., 8278
'Fulgens & Lucres,' 8633

G

Galway, M:, 8815
Gardens and S, 8045
Garson, I: R., 8234
Garvin, K:, 8104
Gaw, A., 8528
Gelhard, T., 8245
'George-a-Green,' 8230
German criticism of S, 8241-53b
Gerould, G. H., 8663
Getten, H:, 8325
Ghost technique, 8788
Giaccone, F. X., 8417
Gibb, M. A., 8099
Gielgud, J., 8407, 8450
Gilbert, A. H., 8124
Gilby, T., 8605
Glen, E:, 8286
Glenn, I., 8019
Goethe, 8251
Goldman, M. S., 8689
Goodwin, G., 8015
Gray, A., 8699
Greek tragedy, Interpolations in, 7954
Green, F. C., 8192, 8235
Green, Z. E., 8728
Greene, R., 8230, 8254-57
Greenwood, E., 8023
Greg, W. W., 7983, 8281, 8416, 8422, 8476, 8636
Gregor, J., 8244, 8774
Greville, F., 8683
Grierson, H. J. C., 8702
Griesbach, I:, 8791
Groben, M:, 8249
Grosse, F., 8625
Grubb, M., 8295, 8398
Grumette, J., 8459
Guéhenno, J., 8368
Guppy, H., 8156
Gurrey, J., 8601

H

Haight, G. S., 8160
Hale, A: B., 8011

Hall, E. V., 7996
Hall, J., 8147
Halliwell-Phillipps collection, 8202a
Hamer, D., 8732
Hamilton, C., 8770
Hamlet, 8253b
'Hamlet,' S's, 7954, 7958, 8122, 8132, 8365, 8407-59, 8666, 8772
Hammond, P., 8564
Handwriting of the 16th century, 8258
Haraszti, Z., 8232
Harbage, A., 7961, 8121, 8133, 8175
Harbage, A., 8177
Harder, J. H., 8165, 8371
Hardy, T., 8791
Hardy, W. G., 8001
Harrington, J., 8100
Harris, M. D., 7997
Harrison, G. B., 8178, 8207-08, 8210, 8502
Harsnett, 8497
Hart, A., 7960, 8190, 8326, 8460, 8541, 8584, 8637, 8691
Harvey G., 7966, 8105, 8259, 8260
Hastings, W. T., 8067, 8818
Hatton, E:, 8097a
Heffner, R., 8704-05
Heine, A., 8650
Henderson, P., 8077, 8214
Henderson, W. B. D., 8577
Henry, F. C., 8042
'Henry IV,' S's, 8307, 8375, 8384, 8460-70, 8483
'Henry V,' S's 8463, 8471-73a
'Henry VI,' S's, 8474
'Henry VIII,' S's, 8478-84
Henry VIII, King, 8480, 8484
Hepwith, J., 8712
Herbs in S, 8045
Herrick, R., 8114, 8143, 8258-59
Herrington, H. W., 7966
Herzberg, M., 8410
Heuhof, H., 8567
Hewett-Thayer, H. W., 8243
Heywood, J., 8627
Heywood, T., 8260
Hicks, G., 8034, 8624
Hillebrand, H. N., 8075
Hinton, E. M., 8100-01, 8257, 8266, 8665
Hintz, H. W., 8701
Hoffman, E:, 8761
Holinshed, R., and 'Henry VI,' 8475
Homer, 7970, 8051, 8811
Homilies and S, The, 7960
Houben, H. H., 8251
Howe, W:, 8020
Hubbell, G. S., 8543
Hubler, E., 8493
Hudson, H. H., 8685, 8712
Hughes, A. H., 8433
Hughes, J., 8704
Hughes, M., 8737
Hughey, R:, 8140
Humor, 8059
Hunt, T. B., 8437
Hutcherson, D., 8648

I

Imagery, S's, 8308
Imagination and poetry, 8589, 8591
Influence, S's, 8175, 8262-63
Ireland, 8100-01, 8264-66
Ireland, W. H., 8232
Irvine, St. J., 8007
Irving, H., 7956
Italy, 8267-73

J

Jackson, J. H., 8209
James I, King, 8274-76
Jameson, R. D., 8086, 8159
Japan and S, 8277-78
Jaques, S's, 8399, 8401
Jealousy of Leontes, 8588
Jenkins, E:, 8006
Jenkins, H., 8052, 8254
Jenkins, R., 8717
Jennens, C., 8201
Joan of Arc, 8238
Johnson, F. R., 8732
Johnson, M., 8525
Johnson, S., 8092, 8387a
Johnson, T., 7990
Jones, B., 7955
Jones, C. E., 8633
Jones, D: C., 8317
Jones, H. S. V., 8715
Jones, R., 8322
Jonson, B., 8279-94, 8312, 8387a
Judge, C. B., 8258
Judge, C. B., 8636
Judson, A. C., 8714
Jump, J. D., 8342

K

Kahn, L. W., 8560
Kahrl, G. M., 8263
Kane, W., 8524
Kapp, R., 8663, 8715, 8735
Kates, H. S., 7952
Keck, K. M., 8405
Kelcy, A., 8427
Keller, W., 8523
Kennard, J. S., 8058
Kennedy, C. W., 8050
Kern, H., 8792
Kesten, H., 8004
Kidder, E. E., 8364
King, L:, 8475
.King John,' S's, 8489
'King Lear,' Ss, 8490-8502, 8666, 8668, 8791
Kirk, R. R., 8590
Kisby, R. H., 8027
Kleeman, R. H., 8033
Klien, M:, 8253b
Knappert, E. C., 8269
Knevett, R., 8734
Knorr, F., 8253a
Knowles, V., 8610
Knowlton, E. C., 8722
Knox, R. S., 8063
Koller, K., 8707
Komisarjevsky, T., 8070, 8667
Korda, A., 8478
Kreider, P. V., 8817
Kyd, T., 8132, 8295-97

L

Labinski, M., 8402
Lacy, J., 7995
Laertes, 8411
Langermann, H., 8796
Language of S and his contemporaries, 8298-8312, 8314, 8326, 8395, 8486, 8503-04, 8593, 8604, 8815
Latham, E., 8240
Laughter analysed, 8061a
Law, R. A., 8541a
Lawrence, C. E., 8599
Lawrence, W. J., 8343, 8347, 8421-22, 8597, 8746, 8771, 8775-78, 8780a
Leacock, S., 8059
Leak, M:, 8056, 8061
Leathes, S., 8612
Lee, H., 8206
Leech, C., 8126, 8206
Leishman, J. B., 8144
Lemmi, C. W., 8709-10, 8729
Lenine, 8368
Lewis, C. D., 8621
Lewis, C. S., 8422
Lewis, H:, 8025
Lindsay, P., 8471
Linklater, E., 8003
Linn, J. W., 8765
Litovski, O., 8168
Loane, G. G., 8046, 8051
Lockert, L., 8783
Locrine, 8230
Lodge, T., 8315-17
Logic in the Elizabethan drama, 8124
London, 8124, 8318
Longworth, C:, 8219
Looney, J. T., 8387a
Lotspeich, H. G., 8697, 8736
Lounsbury, 8235
Love in S, 8803-04
'Love's Labors Lost,' S's, 8503-05- 8750
Lovett, D., 8087
Lowenthal, M., 8367
Luce, M., 8044, 8082, 8385, 8569, 8607-08, 8725, 8803-04
Lucas, L., 8241
Lugovskoi, V., 8397
Lunt, A., 8564
Lyly, J., 8319-20

M

McAllister, G., 8596
'Macbeth,' S's, 8132, 8253b, 8262, 8506-12, 8765-67, 8791
McCabe, L., 8484
McCabe, W. H., 8787
McCain, Jr., J. W., 8627
MacCracken, H. N., 8808
McCullock, J. H., 8274
McCutcheon, R. P., 8590
Machiavelli, N., 8151, 8269-71, 8374, 8814
McIlwraith, A. K., 8149
McKeithan, D. M., 7960
McKerrow, R. B., 8773
MacManaway, J. G., 8549
Malapropism, 8304
Malvolio, 8581
Mandin, L., 7974

Manly, J. M., 8094
Mannin, E:, 8030
Manuals, 8321
Marionettes, 8058
Markham, G., 8100
Marlowe, C., 7992, 8322-39, 8365, 8391
Marshall, B., 8016
Marshall, R., 8267
Marston, J., 8136, 8340, 8341
Martin, B., 8521
Martin, L. C., 8149
Marx, K., and S, 8670
Masks, 8058, 8342-45
Mason, A. E. W., 7958
Mason, J. E., 8213
Massinger, P., 8346-51
Massingham, H. J., 8319
Mather, C. C., 8766
Matthews, W., 8680, 8682
Matthiessen, F. O., 8611
Mawer, A., 8473
Maxwell, B., 7980, 7982, 8185
Meals, Eliz'n, 8171a
'Measure for Measure,' S's, 8513
Medicine and S, 8215, 8352-58a, 8574, 8762
Medicine in the Middle Ages, 8355
Medicine in the 16th Century, 8354, 8357
Meissner, P., 8119
Mèlése, M:, 8327, 8346, 8678
Mèlése, P., 8236
'Merchant of Venice, The,' S's, 7954, 8514-18, 8820
'Merry Wives of Windsor, The,' S's, 8300, 8375, 8519-20
Merten, M:, 8196
Meyer, G., 8661
Michel, P., 8374
Middleton, T., 8359-63
'Midsummer Night's Dream, A,' S's, 8053
Miller, L: Mc C., 8172
Millet, F. B., 8057, 8189, 8786, 8789
Millican, C. B., 8734
Minster, L., 8444
Miranda, 8566
'Mirror for Magistrates, A,' 8137
Mittell, S. F., 8423
Mompessen, Giles, 8348
Monkhouse, A., 8750
Montaigne, M., 8367-74
Montgomery, G., 8507
Moore, B. P., 8692
Moore, J., 8114
Moore, J. R., 8363
Moore, U., 8639
Morgan, F. C., 8217a
Morhardt, M., 8581
Morley, C., 8308
Morley, M., 8779
Morrow, D., 8624
Morrow, O. G., 8038
Morsbach, L., 8336
Mountfort, W., 8336
Movies and S, 8053-53b
'Much Ado about Nothing,' S's, 8528-32
Mueller, K. A., 8270
Mueller, V., 8393
Muir, K., 8311
Mulcaster, R., 8205
Munday, A., 8727
Murphy, G. H., 8081
Murry, J. M., 8073
Music, 8103, 8375-78
Myers, H. A., 8061a
Myrick, K. O., 8687
Mysticism and poetry, 8592
Mythology, 8379

N

Naae, T. T., 7975
Name, S's, 7996, 8000, 8380-81
Names in S, 8386, 8773
Nashe, T., 8382-83
Natural history in S, 8383a-8385
Neale, J., 8758
Neckhina, M., 8670
Neill, K., 8738
Nels, S., 8496
Nethercot, A. H., 8177
Newdigate, B. H., 8279
Newspapers, Rare, 8164
Nicholson, F. C., 8202a
Nicolai, H., 8425
Nicoll, A., 7991
Noble, R., 7984, 8386, 8516, 8541
Norman, C., 7992
Norsworthy, L:, 8097a
Noyes, A., 8332
Noyes, R. G., 8293
Nusinov, I., 8492, 8668

O

O'Connell, H. C., 8111
O'Conor, N. J., 8097
Oedipus, 8539

Oliphant, E. H. C., 8442, 8784
Onions, C. T., 8512
Ophelia, 8411, 8446, 8452
Orr, H. R., 8568
Osgood, C. G., 8700
Osric, 8445
O'Sullivan, M. D., 8265
'Othello,' S's, 8234, 8533-41, 8693, 8765, 8767, 8819
Ovingk, B. J. H., 8788
Owlett, F. C., 8331

P

Padelford, F. M., 8700, 8728, 8743
Page, D. L., 7954
Page, N:, 8529
Painter, S., 8097
Palamedes, 8123
Par, A., 8695
Parks, E. W., 7967-68, 7981, 8055, 7174a, 8180, 8228. 8256, 8260, 8289-90, 8296, 8320, 8337, 8344, 8350, 8390, 8585, 8629, 8679, 8688, 8801
Parks, G. B., 8157
Parnassus plays, Notes on, 8118
Paro, F:, 8262
Parrott, T. M., 8075, 8080, 8090
Parsons, J. D., 7973, 8222
Pastoral plays, 8195
Patrick, D., 7989
Patrick, D., 7989
Paul, E., 8758
Paul, H. M., 7987
Pearn, B. R., 8122
Peele, G., 8362, 8390-91
Penniman, J. H., 8090
'Pericles,' S's, 8542
Perugini, M. E., 8173
Petsch, R., 8242
Pfeffer, K., 8285
Philadelphia and S, 7963
Phillips, G. W., 8563
Philosophy, 8392-94, 8438, 8706
Pierhal, A., 8812
Plagiarism in the Renaissance, 8150
Plautus, 8055
Playfair, N., 8110
Plays, Length of Eliz'n, 8190
Plimpton, G. A., 8203
Poems, S's, 8543
Poet, The, 8595, 8599, 8609
Poetics, 8078, 8083, 8298, 8310, 8589-8621
Poetry, Eliz'n, 8135-49a
Poetry of S, 8078
Poland and S, 8622
Politics and drama, 8505, 8217, 8625
Politics, S's, 8623-24
Pollard, A. F., 8480
Pollard, A. W., 7998
Polonius, 8429, 8451
Porter, C: E., 8745
Pound, E., 8155
Praz, M., 8143, 8282, 8341
Predecessors of S, 8626-34
Preis, A., 7994a
Prickett, R., 8100
Prior, M. E., 8604
Probst, E., 8757
Proctor, B. W., 8091
Producing S's plays, 8507, 8637-39
Proofreading in S's day, 8635
Prose, Eliz'n, 8150-66, 8321, 8631
Prose vs. poetry, 8594
Proverbs, 8285, 8329, 8641
Psychology, 8063, 8353, 8356, 8358, 8425, 8537, 8588, 8642-44, 8804
Psychopathology and S, 8353, 8356
Punctuation, Massinger's, 8347
Purcell, J. M., 8259, 8464, 8683, 8689, 8730
Puritanism, 8645-47
Purves, J., 8443
Putt, S. G., 8308, 8785

Q

Quarles, F., 8098, 8160
Quartos, The S, 8648-49, 8771
Quiller-Couch, A., 8084
Quinn, A. H., 8090

R

Radio, S and the, 8500, 8650, 8651
Raleigh, W., 8101, 8652-56
Ransome, J. C., 8616-17
'Ratsei's Ghost,' 8156, 8162
Raubicheck, L:, 7962
Ravel, J:, 8024
Ray, J. K., 8329
Raysor, T. M., 8071, 8184
Read, C., 7986
Reading in S's day, 8158

Rebora, P., 8813
Reed, E:, 8037
Reese, G., 8377
Reinhardt, K. F., 8620
Reinhardt, M., 8053a, 8526
Reinhardt, M., 8525
Reisiger, H., 8754
Religion, 8264, 8624, 8657-64
Religion, S's, 8657-58, 8660-61
Rendall, G. H., 7971, 8388
Renwick, W. L., 8103, 8408, 8699, 8700, 8711, 8743
Rhetoric and S., 8242a
Rhythm in poetry, 8612
Rich, B., 8116, 8665
'Richard II,' S's, 7954, 8325, 8462, 8544, 8545
'Richard III,' S's, 8307, 8546-49
Ridley, M. R., 8396, 8406, 8424, 8479, 8485, 8489, 8506, 8513-14, 8536, 8546, 8553, 8532, 8562, 8576, 8580, 8587, 8772, 8809
Riesman, D., 8355
Rivieri, P., 8247
Robin Hood, 8629
Roe, T., 8183
Rogers, K., 8291
Rohde, E: S., 8045, 8079a, 8383a
Rollins, H. E., 8135, 8141
'Romeo & Juliet,' S's, 8307, 8550-59
Rosati, S., 8273
Rothe, H., 8246, 8583
Rowse, A. L, 8112, 8210
Russell, A. J., 8657
Russia and S, 8368, 8393, 8397, 8441, 8491-92, 8496, 8498, 8501a, 8548
Rylands, G., 8448
Rylands Library, 8313
Rymer, T., 8539

S

Sampley, A: M., 8391, 8466
Sandison, H: E., 8654
Sargeaunt, M: J., 8229
Sargent, P., 8600
Sargent, R. M., 8142
Sargent, R. M., 8149a
Sarvis, D., 8169
Sauvage, P., 8558
Sayle, R. T. D., 7988
Schelling, F. E., 8090
Schick, J., 8455
Schildkret, L:, 8594
Schiller and S, 8242b
Schirmer, W. F., 8144, 8242a
Schlagdenhauffen, A., 8250
Schlegel, F., 8249, 8250
Schlegel's translation of S, 8796
Schröer, A., 8439, 8495, 8538
Schuecking, L. L., 8414, 8430, 8434, 8440
Schultz, F., 8252
Schulze, I. L., 8708
Science, Eliz'n, 8675-76
Scott, E:, 8276, 8759
Seaforth, C., 8012
Segond, J., 8795
Seneca's Influence, 8055, 8418
Sennwald, A., 8525
Serjeantson, M: S., 7991, 8302
Shaaber, M. A., 8202
Shahani, R. G., 8089
'Shakespeare' as a name, 7996, 8000, 8380-81
Shann, R:, 8026
Shapiro, I. A., 8183
Sharpe, R. B., 8117, 8799
Sharpham, E., 8126
Shelley, P. B., 8262, 8447, 8710
Shirley, J., 8677-79
Shorthand and S, 8500, 8680-82
Shylock, 8516-17
Sibley, G: M., 8127
Sidney, P., 8683-90
Simmons, E. J., 8672
Simpson, P., 8132, 8635
Skillan, G., 8064
Skillen, M: H., 8766
Small, G. W., 8744
Small, S. A., 8054
Smalley, A., 8787
Smirnov, A. A., 8660
Smith, A. G., 8115
Smith, C. P., 8618
Smith, G. C. M., 8105, 8598, 8719, 8739
Smith, J. H., 7968
Smith, Robert M., 8220, 8223, 8225
Smith, Roland M., 8731, 8741
Smollett, S's influence on, 8263
'Sonnets', S's, 8383, 8560-63
Sorenson, F., 8504
Sources, S's, 7984, 8454, 8475, 8504, 8508, 8510, 8691-93, 8725
Spaeth, J. D., 8093
Spain and S, 8695

Spaulding, A: H., 8766
Spencer, H., 8182
Spenser, E., 7966, 8101, 8321, 8398, 8446, 8696-8743
Spenser, E., and S, 8725, 8816
Spiro, T., 8647
Sprague, A. C., 8769
Spurgeon, C: F., 7999, 8060, 8308, 8339, 8642, 8793
Squire, J., 8084, 8174, 8310
Stage, S's, 8744
Staging of S, 8745-46
Stalker, A., 8383
Stasheff, E., 7962
Stauffer, D. A., 8130
Steffan, M:, 8470
Stein, H:, 8724, 8740
Stewart, Jr., G. R., 7964, 8468
Stirling, B., 8706
Stoll, E. E., 8340, 8426, 8539, 8767, 8811
Stoll, E. E., 8075, 8089a
Storr, E. B., 8488
Strachan, L. R. M., 8420
Stratford, 8747-52
Strathmann, E. A., 8135, 8716
Strong, L. A. G., 8595, 8609
Stuart, M:, 8115, 8753-60
Sturgis, M: H., 8566
Summers, M., 8549, 8780
Supernatural, The, 8761-62, 8768
Superstition and language, 8312
Surkhatian, A., 7970
Swinburne, A. C., 8757
Syphilis in S, 8574

T

Talnikov, D., 8667
'Taming of the Shrew,' S's, 8564-65
Tannenbaum, S. A., 7985, 8410, 8819-21
Tannenbaum, S. A., 8069, 8515, 8537, 8634, 8785
Tanner, S. V., 8651
Tasso, B., 8690
Tatlock, J. S. P., 8690
Taylor, H. W., 8765
Taylor, J. R., 8193
Taylor, M., 8224
Taylor, M. A., 8465
Taylor, W., 8284
Tearle, Mr., 8419
Technique, Dramatic, 8084, 8122, 8189, 8242, 8248, 8422, 8424, 8680, 8681, 8763-70, 8811
Technique, S's, 8071, 8242
'Tempest, The,' S's, 8119, 8566-74, 8666
Ten Hoor, G. J., 8292
Tenney, E. A., 8316
Terence, 8055
Text, Determination of correct, 8422
Textual criticism, 7954, 8126, 8347, 8635-36, 8771-73
Thaler, A., 8816
Thieme, H., 8179
Thompson, D. W., 8116
Thompson, E., 8107, 8570, 8653
Thrall, W. F., 8720
Thurmann, M:, 8154
Tieck, L., 8243, 8796
Tilley, M. P., 8329, 8626
Tillotson, G., 8314
Tillotson, K:, 8699
Time in S, 8071
'Timon of Athens,' S's, 8574-75
Titles of books from S, 8001-43
Tomlinson, H. M., 8036
Topicalities in S, 8076
Touchstone, 8401a
Tourneur, C., 8132, 8781-84
Tovey, D. E., 8375
Tragedy, 8785-95
Translations of S, 8241, 8796
Tripp, E., 8017
'Troilus & Cressida,' S's, 8576-78
Truman, N., 8167
Tudors, The, 8701, 8211
Turner, G., 8753
Tuve, R:, 8696
'Twelfth Night,' S's, 8306, 8579-83
'Two Gentlemen of Verona,' S's, 8306, 8583
'Two Noble Kinsmen,' 8584-85

U

Udall, N., 8632
Ulbach, E., 8664
Usury in S, 8518, 8820

V

Vachell, H. A., 8041
Vaganay, H., 8446
Van Dam, B. A. P., 8324, 8330, 8499
Van Doren, M., 8088, 8525
Vaughan, H:, 8039
Verse, S's, 8798
Vexler, J., 8061b
Villey, P., 8369
Voltaire, 8235, 8539
Von Ritook, E. 8794
Vordieck, 8586

W

Wagner, B. M., 8139, 8146, 8361
Wagner, E: B., 8568
Waldman, M., 8238
Walker, A:, 8056, 8113
Walker, G., 8646
Walker, P. C. G., 8209
Walker, R., 7990
Walkley, T., 8283
Walley, H. B., 8517
Walls, E., 8752
War of the theatres, 8078, 8799
Ward, C. E., 8351
Ward, L., 8034
Warpeha, M: J., 8079
Warren, C. H., 8083, 8686
Watson, S: R., 8345
Watts, R., 8053b
Waugh, E:, 8095
Webb, F:, 8551
Webster, J., 8800-01
Weever, J., 8136
Weigelin, E., 8415, 8428
Weitzmann, F. W., 8153
Welby, A., 8000
Welsford, E:, 8226, 8401a, 8501b
Westerberg, A. G., 8259
Weston, H., 8763
White, E. A., 8291
White, H. O., 8150
Whitefriar's Theatre, Site of, 8775
Wild, F., 8120
Wile, I. S., 8352, 8501
Williams, C. H., 8217
Williams, F. B., 7993, 8139, 8335
Williams, H., 8638
Williams, I. A., 8174
Williamson, G., 8802
Wilson, A. H., 7963
Wilson, J. D., 7998, 8272, 8408, 8422, 8448
Wilson, J. D., 8409, 8416, 8430, 8440, 8448
Wilson, P. W., 8053
Wimperis, A., 8478
Wine, C:, 8630
'Winter's Tale,' S's, 8385, 8586-88
Wit, 8802
'Wit & Science,' Notes on, 8634
'Wit & Wisdom,' Notes on, 8626
Withington, R., 8191
Wohlers, H., 8092
Wolf, A., 8357, 8643, 8676
Wolff, M. J., 7970a, 8065
Wolfson, R:, 8658
Wolsey, 8481-82
Women in England, 8805
Women in S, 8803, 8804
Wood, H. H., 8341
Wood, N., 8630
Woods, A. H., 8574
Wooll, E:, 8029
Words, Foreign, in England, 8302
Words, Obsolete, 8303
Worrall, W, 8575
Worthington, M:, 8014
Wren, P. C., 8008
Wright, F., 8527
Wright, H. G., 8255
Wright, L. B., 8131, 8158, 8212, 8645, 8662, 8675, 8797, 8805
Wurtsbough, J., 8698, 8713
Wyatt, T., 8628

Y

Yates, F: A., 8113, 8272
Yorick's identity, 8444
Young, G. M., 8408
Young, K., 8432
Young, S., 8134, 8550

Z

Zeitlin, J., 8372
Zilboorg, G., 8762
Zinsser, H., 8215
Zweig, S., 8756, 8758

COMMUNICATIONS

SHAKSPERE'S GHOSTS

By SAMUEL A. SMALL

The anonymous article in the July (1935) BULLETIN concerning ghost technique conveys only a partial understanding, I think, about the stage usage of these supernatural creatures. It is all right to make interpretations from the subjective point of view, as the writer does; but there is also a dramatic problem of stage usage to be considered. Shakspere kept the subjective workings of his characters under strict control, no doubt, and never violated natural laws; but the realism connected with stage devices of all kinds and its reactions on the audience followed most naturally in the playwright's mind.

Shakspere presents his ghosts at the moment when the situation is ripe. Richard and Brutus, like Hamlet and Macbeth, see real ghosts because their minds are in the proper condition for it. A comparison with Seneca is pertinent. The trepidation of Medea's mind is pictured by Seneca in rhetorical language. Her mind is harassed with visions, and she rages on through long rhetorical speeches in a torment that finally overcomes her reason. In one passage she actually tells us that she sees the vision of her murdered brother. Why does not Seneca actually bring the ghost of her dead brother on the stage? In the answer to this question we see the difference between Seneca and Shakspere. Throughout her mental ravings, Medea's mind is never broken. Her spirit remains strong to the very end of the play. How different this is from those characters in Shakspere who have ghostly visitors. They creep in before the audience when Richard, Brutus and the others have lapses of will. Seneca's characters are wilful; even in her broodings Medea never swerves from her insane purpose of killing her children before the very face of her husband, Jason. Shakspere's ghosts in every case result from a broken will.

But Shakspere's habit as a craftsman proves his ghosts to be real. Brutus, his spirit broken, is sitting in a situation that's ripe for the appearance of a ghost. The presence of

the boy, Lucius, the soft music, and the low burning of the taper give the setting for the ghost's entrance. Brutus, on the approach of the ghost, tells us plainly not only how he feels about the ghost but also how the audience may feel:

> "How ill this taper burns! Ha! Who comes here?
> I think it is the weakness of mine eyes
> That shapes this monstrous apparitiön.
> It comes upon me. Art thou anything?
> Art thou some God, some angel, or some devil,
> That mak'st my blood cold and my hair to stare?
> Speak to me what thou art." IV, iii, 275-281).

Here Shakspere is putting the ideas of the audience into the mouth of Brutus. The ghost is real to the audience because he's real to Brutus. This is shown by the fact that Brutus himself proceeds to test the reality of the ghost: "Did'st thou see anything?" he asks of Lucius; "saw *you* anything?" he asks of Varro.

The ghost that appears in the queen's bedroom in *Hamlet* is real because Hamlet says so:

> *Ham.:* Do *you* see nothing there?
> *Queen:* Nothing at all; yet all that is I see.
> *Ham.:* Nor did you nothing *hear?*
> *Queen:* No, nothing but ourselves.
> *Ham.:* Why, look you there! look, how it steals away!
> My father in his habit as he liv'd!
> Look where he goes, e'en now, out at the portal! (III, iv, 132-136)

The audience sees what Hamlet sees.

The ghost at the banquet scene in *Macbeth* is real because Macbeth says so:

> *Macbeth:* The table's full.
> *Lennox:* Here's a place reserved, sir.
> *Macbeth:* Where?

Here, too, the audience sees what Macbeth sees.

In the case of Richard, when he arouses himself from his sleep, he states that he has dreamed, but it's to be noticed that his "coward conscience" accepts the ghosts as objective realities:

> "Methought the souls of all that I had murder'd
> Came to my tent; and everyone did threat
> To-morrow's vengeance on the head of Richard. (V, iii, 204-206)

Houghton College,
Houghton, N. Y.

Adding a Word to Shakspere's Vocabulary

By Samuel A. Tannenbaum

Marc Antony, informed by his 'Seruant' that Brutus had given his word of 'Honor' that if he came to the slayers of Caesar he would be 'satisfied' and would be permitted to 'Depart vntouch'd,' appears before them. Brutus, taking the initiative, proceeds to reassure the pleading Antony that his desire for death at the hands of those who had 'cut off' his friend would not be gratified:

> 'To you, our Swords haue leaden points, *Marke Antony:*
> Our Armes in strength of malice, and our Hearts
> Of Brothers temper, do receiue you in,
> With all kinde loue, good thoughts and reuerence.'
>
> (III, i, 196-199.)

The second of these verses does not satisfy readers of the play, for obviously it says the very opposite of what the situation requires and what is implied in the other three verses. 'In strength of malice' can mean only 'full of hostility' or (as Schmidt defines it) 'having full power of doing you harm'—which can hardly be expected to reassure Antony, and which is incongrous with the immediately preceding assertion about swords with 'leaden points.'

The fantastic atempts to retain the Folio text may be read in the Furness *Variorum* and in some letters in the London *Times Literary Supplement* of April 23, 1923, and later. A few of those who could make no sense of the Folio reading have suggested various emendations of the passage. Furness records Pope's 'exempt from malice' (which wholly disregards the *ductus litterarum*), Capell's 'no strength of malice' (clever but unlikely and ignores the semicolon of the preceding line), Singer's 'in strength of amity' (which makes good sense, does not spoil the metre, but makes the improbable assumption that 'amity'—written 'amitie'—was misread as 'malice'), Keightley's 'in strength of friendship' (paleographically impossible), Collier's 'in strength of welcome' (impossible for the same reason) or 'in strength of manhood' (which is absurd, besides being paleographically impossible), Cartwright's 'in strength of justice' (an impossible misreading in secretary script), an anonymous emender's 'unfraught of malice' (which makes excellent sense but is paleographically improbable in Shakspere), and another

anonymous suggestion of 'forspent of malice' (unjustifiable paleographically). Other suggestions, mentioned by Mr. F. Madan, are 'reproof of malice' and 'unstring their malice'. Mr. Madan, rejecting all previous suggestions, proposes that we read 'in strength of milice' ('milice' being a French word used in the sixteenth century—by Frenchmen only—for 'military discipline or training')—which is ingenious but utterly improbable for Shakspere, especially after swords with leaden points.

Brutus, it is clear, wishes Antony to understand that the slaying of Caesar was a patriotic action which was prompted solely by the desire to rid Rome of the Tyrant. That terrible deed done, the saviors of Rome bear no animosity towards any. This was certainly so as regards Brutus; that is why he says that though by their hands they 'appeare bloody and cruell', their hearts are 'pittifull.' Keeping these facts in mind, we must read, *me judice,* 'Our arms, unstrength'd of malice,' 'unstrengthed', meaning—as Shakspere undoubtedly knew—'enfeebled', 'lacking,' 'of' meaning 'as regards,' and 'malice' meaning 'ill-will or hatred,' 'anger,' or 'resentment'. That the word 'unstrengthed' was current in Shakspere's day—even though it does not occur in his works—is clear from the Oxford Dictionary's quotations (sub 'unstrengthen') from Florio (1598), Hooker (1597), Marston (1604), and others. One who bears in mind the frequency of minim errors in Shakspere (especially when such letters as *in, un, ni,* and *nu* come together), Shakspere's bad habit of not dotting his *i*'s, and the frequency with which final *d* is mistaken for *e,* will have no difficulty in accepting 'in strength(e)' as a misreading of 'unstrength'd'. 'In' for 'un' occurs in the first quarto of *King Lear* (II, ii, 78)—'inloose' for 'unloose,'—and we have an example of the omission of final *d* (or *t*) in the same text at II, ii, 173 ('ouerwatch' for 'o're-watch'd').

In conclusion we may point out that in *Julius Caesar* alone Shakspere has more than fifty words, not counting compounds, which occur nowhere else in his writings. And, furthermore, in the verses we have just been discussing there is a locution—'receive you in'—for which there is no known parallel either in Shakspere or in any other writer.

Queen Elizabeth and Woman Pages

Marion Ansel Taylor.

Whether literature can ever be thoroughly divorced from the life of the times which produced it, has long been a subject of controversy among critics. E. E. Stoll, for example, in his *Shakespeare Studies,* has said, "Literature is, of course, not life, neither history nor material for history, but a scrroll whereon are traced and charactered the unfettered thoughts of writer and reader."[1] One of Mr. Stoll's important arguments is that the woman-page in Shakspere's and other plays was remote from the life of the sixteenth century, since women did not wear men's clothing "much more than they do today."[2] Because her essay was probably written in 1921, I shall not discuss Marlene Dietrich and her advocacy of men's trousers for women, but I should like to show that the idea was not foreign to Shakspere's time. Such a disguise was contemplated by no less a person than Queen Elizabeth herself.

It was in September, 1564, that Queen Mary of Scotland sent Sir James Melville of Halhill as ambassador, to Queen Elizabeth. Elizabeth, with her youth and good looks, was very feminine in her curiosity regarding her Scotch kinswoman. But let Sir James tell of his interview with the English queen in his own quaint way.

> I was ernest to be dispetchit; but sche [Queen Elizabeth] said I tyred schoner of hir company nor sche did of myn. I said, albeit I had na occasion ty tyre, that it was tym to retourn; bot I was stayed twa dayes langer till I mycht se hir dance, as I was infourmed; quhilk being done, she inquyred at me whither sche or the Quen dancit best. I said, the Quen dancit not sa hich and disposedly as sche did. Then again sche wassit that sche mycht se the Quen, at some convenient place of meating. I offerit to convoy hir secretly in Scotland be poist, clothed lyk a paige disguysed, that sche mycht se the Quen; as K. James the 5. past in France disguysed, with his awen ambassadour, to se the Duc of Vendomes sister that suld haue bene his wyf; and how that hir

---

[1] Quoted by Edwin Greenlaw, *The Province of Literary History,* Baltimore, the Johns Hopkins Press, 1931, p. 90. I am referring to Mr. Greenlaw's book rather than to Mr. Stoll's because the former presents able arguments against this theory in discussing Mr. Stoll and others.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 91.

chamber suld be kepit as thoch sche wer seak, in the mean tym, and nane to be preuy thereto bot my lady Stafford, and ane of the grumes of hir chamber. Sche said, Alace! gene sche mycht do it; and seemed to lyk weill of sic kynd of langage, and vsed all the meanis sche culd to cause me to persuad the Quen of the gret loue that sche bure vnto hir, and was myndit to put away all geleusies and suspitions, and in tymes comyng a straiter friendchip to stand betwen them then euer had bene of before; and promysed that my dispache suld be delyuerit vnto me very schortly, be Mester Cicill at Londoun.[3]

Would that Queen Bess might have carried out her wish; she would have been a spirited, witty Rosalind! Is literature ever thoroughly divorced from life?

Illinois State
Normal University

[3] Sir James Melville, *Memoirs of His Own Life,* Edinburgh, the Bannantyne Club, 1827, p. 125-126.

A SHAKSPERE CONFERENCE IN THE U. S. S. R.

The Shaksperian conference held in the Moscow Club of the Masters of Art represents an important event in the history of the solution of the complex and stirring problem of Shakspere.

This was an attempt to sum up the material which had already been accumulated on Shakspere by science, and on this basis to raise a number of new questions of vital importance to the further development of the Soviet theatre and drama.

The principal speaker at the conference was S. Dinamov, whose object was to reveal the philosophy of the creative work of the great playwright and to give a picture of the social and political atmosphere of the Elizabethan epoch which determined the role of Shakspere.

On the strength of statements made by Marx and Engels, Dinamov rejected the theory that Shakspere was a feudal artist. Shakspere, said Dinamov, was in reality the artist of the new nobility which developed in Britain after the War of the Roses and whose interests during that period coincided with those of the bourgeoisie.

In analysing Shakspere's work Dinamov raised the problem of the representation of the people in the playwright's tragedies, a problem which has hardly been touched upon in contemporary literature and which is awaiting its special investigator. Another problem awaiting solution is that of the influence of antique culture on the creative work of Shakspere, an influence which made him into one of the greatest realists of all ages.

The conference gave considerable attention to the problem of translating Shakspere. Many of the translators distorted Shakspere, replacing his passion by rhetorical pathos, trimming

and emasculating the inimitable language of his tragedies.

How should Shakspere be translated? Should the problem of accuracy of translation be solved pedantically, that is, shall not a single comma be omitted from the original? shall all the archaisms of the text be preserved? shall the number of lines in the translation be exactly the same as in the original? and so forth.

A. Radlova, admittedly a brilliant translator of Shakspere, who has succeeded in bringing the English playwright as close as possible to the Soviet reader, answered these questions with an emphatic "No". She said that a translator was not a keeper of dead museum values but a mouthpiece through which the geniuses of past ages talk to the living people of our country and our era.

The problem of how to produce Shakspere on the Soviet stage, was discussed in the reports of S. Radlov, the producer, and O. Litovsky.

Citing the examples of the production of *Hamlet* in the Vakhtangov theatre and *Egyptian Nights* in the Kamerny theatre, the speakers endeavoured to show that "Shakesperiments" which spring from a purely schematic approach on the part of the producer to his tasks, from a tendency to hunt after sensational tricks, from a desire to appear original, are bound to fail. One of the manifestations of this originality, according to Radlov, is the peculiar practice of some of the producers in the distribution of roles: they entrust roles to actors who are temperamentally unsuited to the character and the demands of the author.

A. Gvozdev reviewed the stage history of Shakspere for the past 300 years, and Sollertinsky spoke of music in Shakspere's time and of Shaksperian motifs in the works of the greatest composers. Both speakers made use of valuable material, known for the most part only to a very limited circle of authorities on Shakspere.

Reich read a paper on "Shakspere in Modern Germany."

The Shaksperian conference will undoubtedly provide the necessary impetus for the further development of Shaksperian study.

Press and Information Department,

Society for Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, Moscow, U. S. S. R.

EDITORIAL NOTES AND REVIEWS

By S. A. T.

MEMBERSHIP

Now is the time to make a drive for membership. Teachers are being reappointed and in many instances their salaries are being restored. Furthermore, teachers are discovering that in a great many respects they are better off than either lawyers, physicians, dentists, chemists, nurses or engineers; their salaries are fixed, not dependent on competitive striving, and assured. They are now in a position to rejoin the Association from which they resigned four or five years ago. Two dollars a year does not mean so much to them now as it did in 1931 and 1932. This is the time, therefore, when teachers should join our Association and lend their financial support to this Bulletin. From the frequent demands for our bibliographies and for the back numbers of our magazine, and from the many scholarly essays contributed to our pages, it is certain that our Bulletin is a highly valued publication which deserves the support of all persons interested in cultural pursuits and especially in Shakspere, the English Renaissance, and the drama. Every member, and especially the chairmen of our membership committees in the various States, ought to exert his or her utmost efforts now to induct as many persons into the Association as possible. We ought to have at least 5,000 members within a year. With such a membership we could double the capacity of the Bulletin, we could pay something for articles (we are now giving 50 reprints gratis), and we could begin a drive for our real goal: a permanent Shakspere home and a Shakspere theatre in New York.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The editor takes the opportunity to announce to the scholarly world that he has for years been compiling a universal *Bibliography of Shakspere and his Contemporaries,* including poets, dramatists, statesmen, soldiers, scientists, pamphleteers, architects, musicians, etc., etc. This bibliography is arranged exactly as the annual bibliographies issued in the January numbers of this Bulletin. It includes items published in every part of the world and in almost all languages; even unpublished university theses are listed. The compiler fully expects to have the manuscript in condition for publication before the expiration of this year. The cost of printing this important work will undoubtedly be great, inasmuch as the completed manuscript will weigh very nearly twenty-five pounds. Any university interested in its publication is requested to communicate with the editor.

WOMEN

A book which we are reasonably sure many of our younger members will enjoy reading is Mr. Gamaliel Bradford's posthumous *Elizabethan Women* (edited by Mr. Harold O. White and published by Houghton, Mifflin Company, pp. x + 243, $3.). The book makes no pretense at pedantism, which means that it is written simply, clearly and entertainingly and is intended for ordinarily culturted persons. The title of the book is somewhat inappropriate and misleading. The first four chapters are devoted to a popular exposition of the environment, education, home life and social duties of women in Shakspere's

England; the remaining eight chapters are brief studies of the women appearing in the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, John Webster, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, Thomas Middleton, John Ford, and John Shirley, as well as of Shakspere's Cleopatra and the women in *The Fairy Queen.* The publisher's blurb says that the book is 'illustrated' but we find only a frontispiece showing Queen Elizabeth at a picnic in 1575.

A NEEDED BOOK

The Henry E. Huntington Library is to be congratulated in having as its curator of manuscripts so competent an investigator as is Captain R. B. Haselden. His book* gives the reader interested in the investigation of literary and historical documents valuable orientation in the difficult subject of bibliotics, explaining in intelligible language the essentials of the important technical methods of such document-study. The illustrations, conveniently gathered together at the end of the book, are as good as such things can be and help to make the reading of the volume interesting, if not exciting. There are chapters on the proper care and handling of manuscripts, illuminants and light filters, microscopes and magnifiers, the ultra-violet lamp and fluorescence, photography, varieties of measuring instruments, photography with infra-red light, transmitted light, etc.

'For want of a better term' Mr. Haselden adopts the excellent word 'bibliotics' (which the present writer adopted from Mr. Frazer and redefined) to designate 'the study of the entire physical make-up of a manuscript'—a definition which is much too narrow. Mr. Frazer applied the word to a 'study of the essential characters of documents.' My own definition would be 'the study of documents, with a view to determining their history, make-up, date, genuineness or spuriousness, and their source.' I stress this because Mr. Haselden seems (page 4) to restrict the term to such an examination as can aid in the solution of textual problems. The correct reading and transcription of a manuscript is a matter of paleography, not of bibliotics. The two must be kept distinct.

We miss in this book the caution, which experience shows to be necessary, that the ability to read an ancient manuscript does not carry with it the ability to make a bibliotic study of it. The many more or less recent essays on the *Sir Thomas More* problem abundantly prove this. Mr. Haselden should, I think, also have made it clear that it takes a great deal of experience in the examination of documents before one can venture to give an opinion worthy of any respect. It would have been well too to point out that no instruments can take the place of the power of observation and the ability to reason logically.

There is some danger that this book may give readers the impression that without costly and complicated instruments it is impossible to reach sound conclusions about examined documents. As a matter of fact, some very excellent work in bibliotics has been done with ordinary magnifying glasses, low power microscopes, a few simple chemical reagents, and the camera. Thus, for example, after a reading of Mr. Haselden's book one would think that heavily deleted writing can be deciphered only with infra-red light and only if the deletion was not made with ink (page 72). Mr. Haselden will be pleased to learn that a very

* *Scientific Aids for the Study of Manuscripts;* published by the Oxford University Press, 1935, pp. xiv, 108; with 16 collotype plates.

simple way of reading deleted writing is to hold the document up to the light. This may be accomplished in some instances even with the simple photostat. A few years ago, when I was assisting Dr. Rollins in editing Randolph's *Drinking Academy* I read every deleted word in this way.

I wish that Mr. Haselden had explained more fully the value of photographs, especially of enlargements, in the study of erasures, sequence of lines, and alterations. This would have enabled him to explain why photographs are superior to collotype fac-similes, why photostats are inferior to photographs, and why collotypes are usually of no value in the study of a document whose genuineness is in question. But undoubtedly Mr. Haselden will do all this in a future edition of his book.

On one point we take sharp issue with Mr. Haselden. Probably under the influence of some incompetent adviser, he has permitted himself to encroach on a field in which he is not at home. On page 84 he advises 'the observer of handwriting' to be on the look-out for peculiarities in the formation of ovals, [etc.], for eccentricities.' As an example of such an eccentricity he refers to Sir George Buc as having sometimes made use of 'a peculiar sickle-shaped mark to denote a double *l* or as an abbreviation,' his authority for the statement being Mr. A. E. Stamp's ill-considered and superficial work, *The Disputed Revels Accounts.* Mr. Haselden has evidently not read my essay, *More About the Forged Revels Accounts;* had he done so he would have learned that this sickle-shaped mark was in general use in the sixteenth century and that it was not peculiar to Sir George Buc. I may add here too that this curve was employed by Elizabethan penmen even in unabbreviated words and even in words in which the letter *l* does not occur. Mr. Haselden should learn (and should instruct his reader) not to believe everything he reads. Personal peculiarities *are* of the utmost importance in the identification of a penman and in establishing identity or spuriousness, but we must be sure that a characteristic *is* really a personal peculiarity.

A NOTABLE *HAMLET*

Hamlets come and *Hamlets* go, and most of them are soon and easily forgotten. But this is not the case with the *Hamlet* which was produced in the building of the Hecksher Foundation by Dr. Elizabeth P. Stein, assistant professor in the department of English at Hunter College on January 10th and 11th of this year. The players had been well and intelligently rehearsed; the play was colorfully though simply mounted and the costuming was exquisite. The lines were read eloquently, feelingly, and with good discretion. Two bits of new business impressed us particularly: Polonius, bidding his son farewell, forgets his platitudinous maxims and is prompted by Ophelia; Hamlet (in the nunnery scene) enters reading a book and lies down full length on the floor in front of a fireplace to meditate on being or not-being. The former was very effective, the latter was not. Mr. Ralph Austen looked every inch the Prince of Denmark. It's a great pity that Broadway could not see this *Hamlet.*

A DANGEROUS BOOK[1]

Professor William B. Otis and Mr. Morris H. Needleman have just published a book which we view with a great deal of misgiving. Notwithstanding the authors' warnings, teach-

[1] *An Outline-History of English Literature to Dryden;* New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., pp. xiv, 326; 75c.

ers and students are very likely to use this manual as a shortcut to a 'knowledge' of English literature; students will not read the poems, plays, etc., summarized in this book, but will memorize what is here said about these works. There is too much 'cramming' in our schools already; that is how most of our teachers learned what little they know, and that is how most of our students pass their examinations. The better a book like this is the more it is likely to be abused. And there is no denying that in many respects the compilers of this manual have done their work well, perhaps too well. They have condensed a great deal of matter, having made good use of available bibliographical material (much of which is listed in the footnotes). The arrangement of the contents of the book is excellent; so is the index. For ready reference we know of nothing more compact or convenient than this book.

But notwithstanding all this, the book is not a safe book to put in the hands of the uncritical. It contains too many misleading statements and actual mistakes. The compilers give the impression of not having read carefully or of not having digested what they read. We are puzzled by such statements as that Ophelia is 'unsophisticated,' Claudius is 'a rather weak villain,' Hamlet speaks to his mother 'with curt respect,' and Ophelia 'is not grossly insulted by Hamlet until he suspects her innocence'; Arden of Feversham is characterized (p. 296), as 'avaricious and cruel'; 'Octavia, a foil to Cleopatra . . . is virtuous to the point of frigidity' [Nonsense!]; 'Octavius is not strikingly efficient'; 'Antony is enslaved by lust' [No; by love.] Cassio suffers from a 'weakness for wine and women' and Brabantio is 'jealous [!] and tyrannical'; the versatility of Shakspere's genius 'has been attributed to the possible fact [!] that William was possibly [!] French on his father's side and Saxon on his mother's side'; the Shakspere coat-of-arms was 'applied for in 1596, [and] confirmed and extended by the Heralds' College to John Shakespeare (1599).' (This is meaningless and incorrect.) It is not true that William Shakspere was 'Principal actor in Jonson's *Sejanus.*' There is no justification for saying that Shakspere's life may have been clouded by the rise of the Children of the Chapel. It is not certain that Shakspere 'supported attempts to enclose common lands at Stratford.' The statement (p. 162) that Judith Shakspere was 'formally excommunicated' is more than doubtful. We more than doubt, too, the value of referring the student in all seriousness to a satirical article on a Freudian interpretation of Shakspere's life in Mr. Wickham's essay 'Did Shakespeare murder his father?'. It is certainly stretching the truth a great deal to say (p. 190) that 'It is generally known that . . . Shakespeare's political ideas were influenced by the Earl of Essex." Nothing of the sort is 'known;' it is highly improbable. And where in the world did Messrs. Otis and Needleman get the perverse notion that 'The play [*Sir Thomas Moore*] might be a forgery by J. P. Collier'!? (See p. 226.) What makes the matter worse is that careless readers might get the idea that the present writer is responsible for this preposterous opinion.

These compilers have attempted too much.